

MONKS AND MONASTERIES IN CONSTANTINOPLE :
(FOURTH TO NINTH CENTURIES)

G. Ece Turnator

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of MPhil
at the
University of St Andrews



2003

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13593>

This item is protected by original copyright

**“Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople
(Fourth-Ninth Centuries)”**

G. Ece Turnator

MPhil.

9 March, 2003



ProQuest Number: 10166857

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166857

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

TL
E358

ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the changes in the legal, economic and political status as well as the topographical location of the monasteries in Constantinople between the fourth and the ninth centuries.

Roughly from the late fourth up until the end of the sixth century, there was a gradual increase in the number of monasteries. This trend was counterweighted by almost complete silence in the sources throughout the seventh and the eighth centuries. The ninth century, however, constituted a return to the trend of the early centuries. Monks and monasteries "returned" to the city with a vengeance.

This "return" was inevitably linked to the prevailing conditions during the previous centuries marked by, first, the final decline of the late Roman world and its institutions, and second, the Iconoclast controversy in Byzantium between the early eighth and the mid-ninth centuries.

Overall, following primarily the evidence preserved in the *vitae* and the acts of the councils, one can conclude that, by the end of the ninth century, the integration of the monks into Byzantine society was complete. The monasteries had become an integral part of Constantinople and its Christian topography.

I, G. Ece Turnator, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 42,500 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

9 March, 2003

I was admitted as a research student in September, 2001 and as a candidate for the degree of MPhil. in September, 2001; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St Andrews between 2001 and 2002.

9 March, 2003

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of MPhil. in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

9 March, 2003

In submitting this dissertation to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any *bona fide* library or research worker.

9 March, 2003

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Magdalino for all his advice and assistance, Chris Craun for valuable discussions and comments on a number of issues raised in the dissertation, Konstantinos Zafeiris for his help in deciphering the Greek texts, William Campbell, April Harper, Caroline Proctor and Paula Stiles, all Ph.D. students in the Department of Medieval History, for correcting the English as well as commenting on the monks and saints of Byzantium.

Finally, I owe many thanks to my parents, who, through their kind and willing support, have made real this unforgettable year in St Andrews.

"Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople (Fourth-Ninth Centuries)"

List of Abbreviations

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Ascetics, Cenobites and the Origins of Monasticism.....	3
III. From the Desert to the "Oikoumene": Aspects of Byzantine Monasticism.....	11
IV. Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople: The Early Centuries.....	16
i. Monks as Convicts: The Trial of Eutychios (448-451).....	42
ii. Monks as Prosecutors: The Councils of 518 and 536.....	53
V. Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople: From the Seventh to the Ninth Century.....	73
i. The Seventh Ecumenical Council (787) and Beyond.....	83
VI. Imperial and Ecclesiastical Legislation Concerning Monks and Monasteries.....	98
VII. Conclusion.....	109
VIII. Bibliography.....	115

ABBREVIATIONS

AASS	<i>Acta Sanctorum</i> , 71 vols. Paris, 1863-1940
AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ACO	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i> , eds. E. Schwartz, and J. Straub, Berlin-Leipzig, 1914-1983
BAR	British Archaeological Reports
BBOM	Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs
BMFD	<i>Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents</i> , eds. J. Thomas and A. Constantinides-Hero, 4 vols., Washington D.C., 2000
BMGS	<i>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</i>
ByzF	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CFHB	Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
CTh	<i>The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions</i> , trans. C. Pharr, Princeton, 1952
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
IstMitt	<i>Istanbuler Mitteilungen</i> , Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Istanbul
JÖB	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Mansi	<i>Sacrorum Conciliorum</i> , Florence and Venice, 1759-1798
NotCP	<i>Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae</i> , ed. O. Seeck, <i>Notitia dignitatum</i> , Frankfurt am Main, repr. 1962, 229-243
OCA	Orientalia christiana analecta
PL	Patrologia Latina Database http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk
PLRE	<i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , eds. A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Robert, 4 vols., Cambridge, 1971-1992
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
RBén	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
RÉB	<i>Revue des Études Byzantines</i>
SCH	<i>Studies in Church History</i>

- Theophanes* *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor*, trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, Oxford, 1997
- TM* *Travaux et Mémoires*, Centre de Recherches d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance
- V. Alexander* "Vie d' Alexandre I' Acémète", ed. E. G. M. J. de Stoop, *PO* 6.5. (1911), 658-751
- V. Dalmat.* *Imperium Orientale*, ed. A. M. Banduri, vol. II, Venice, 1729, 514-525
- V. Daniel* *Les saints stylites*, ed. H. Delehay, Brussels, repr. 1962, 89-168
- V. Dios* *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. Delehay, *AASS Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, Brussels, 1902, cols. 829-830
- V. Eutychios* *Vita Eutychii Patriarchae Constantiopolitani*, ed. C. Laga, Brepols-Turnhout, 1992
- V. Hypatios* *Vie d'Hypatios*, trans. and ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, Paris, 1971
- V. Isaac* *AASS*, Mai., VII, cols. 244-253
- V. Markell.* "La vie ancienne de saint Marcel l'Acémète ", ed. G. Dagron, *AB* 86 (1968), 271-321
- V. Maximus* "An Early Syriac Vita of Maximus the Confessor", trans. S. Brock, *AB* 91 (1973), 299-346
- V. Nikeph. A.* "La vie de Saint Nicéphore de Médikion en Bithynie d. 813", ed. F. Halkin, *AB* 78 (1960), 396-430
- V. Nikeph. B.* "Saint Nicéphore de Médikion d'après un synaxaire du Mont Synai", ed. F. Halkin, *AB* 88 (1970), 13-16
- V. Olymp.* "Vita Sanctae Olympiadis", *AB* 15 (1896), 400-423

I. Introduction

Asceticism was born in Egypt in the third century. Monasticism soon followed in its footsteps. For both the solitary ascetics and the monks, who lived in monasteries under a certain rule, the aim was to imitate the angelic life, to experience it in this world. In practice there was not a strict division between asceticism and monasticism; the two practices were tightly related. In addition, there was great variety in implementation in different parts of the Later Roman Empire.

In the first part of the present study I shall be dealing with the definitions of asceticism and monasticism. The second part is on the aspects of what I term Byzantine monasticism, better coined as Anatolian monasticism by T. S. Miller.¹ Although Antony, the first ascetic, and Pachomios, the first hegoumenos, were both from Egypt, which was part of the empire until the seventh century, it was rather the monasticism that developed in Asia Minor that left its imprint on the monastic practice in Byzantium.

The main concern of the thesis, however, is the role of the monks and monasteries in Constantinople between the fourth and the ninth centuries. The earliest records on the early ascetics and monks date from the late fourth century. Their appearance in Constantinople was part of the trend in Christianisation of the empire for which the reign of Theodosios I (379-395) constituted the turning point.

The activities of the monks and ascetics were closely associated with the preferences of especially wealthy Constantinopolitans. The latter seem to have come from a variety of backgrounds. The most influential groups among them were members of the aristocratic families from Rome or from eastern cities, new aristocrats of Gothic or other tribal origins. At the court, the palace eunuchs seem to have played a particularly important role in the foundation of monasteries. Most of the early ascetics and monks were either originally from the eastern parts of the empire or first learned their craft there. The coming together of the monks, ascetics and the wealthy aristocrats and court officials was the most important aspect of monasticism in Constantinople.

The foundation of monasteries has to be viewed together with other undertakings like church building and involvement in charitable activities in which the preferences of the wealthy members of the Constantinopolitan society played an important role. Altogether, the churches, monasteries and charities defined and determined the Christian topography in Constantinople and did so increasingly following the late fourth century.

¹ T. S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire* (Baltimore and London, 1997), p. 121.

The sources on early monks and ascetics in Constantinople are very scarce. The most important are the *vitae* and the acts of the councils. These two are partly complemented by imperial and ecclesiastical legislation which render a general view on the status of the monks. In addition, there are occasional references to monks and monasteries in histories and chronicles. Among the remaining sources on monasteries in Constantinople the most important is the *Patria Konstantinoupoleos* which dates from the late tenth century. However, it is largely legendary and therefore usually unreliable. No foundation document (*typikon*) of a Constantinopolitan monastery survives before the ninth century. Given the circumstances, particularly in the absence of sufficient archaeological evidence, almost everything depends on the written sources and above all on the interpretation of not only what they say but also of what remains unsaid and the possible reasons thereof.

The general trend of monks and monasteries in Constantinople has already been outlined by J. Pargoire and G. Dagron. In addition, A. Berger, P. Magdalino and C. Mango have discussed the nature of the early Constantinopolitan topography and its implications.² Yet, more monographical studies are required for both a better understanding of the activities of the early monks in Constantinople as well as the city's topography.

I have relied on primarily the evidence provided by the acts of the councils of 448, 518, 536 and 787, putting together the information they provide with the information in the *vitae* and histories that date roughly from corresponding periods. I have tried to link this with imperial and ecclesiastical legislation. Altogether they render the very general trends on the changes in the status of the monks and monasteries in Constantinople between the fourth and ninth centuries. The present study by no means covers all the primary and secondary sources on the period. Despite its limits, however, hopefully, it renders the changes in the status of the monks and the activities of the monasteries in Constantinople following the fourth century, giving enough evidence as to why the ninth century is appropriate to put a fullstop; after the ninth century, monasticism in Constantinople as well as in the empire takes on a form distinct from what preceded it.

² See also pp. 23-24 below.

II. Ascetics, Cenobites and the Origins of Monasticism

The first monks and ascetics were early Christians who aspired to reach the ideals professed and exemplified in their own lives. Christianity in the late third and early fourth centuries was still in the process of formation. Eusebios, bishop of Caesarea (d. 339), for example referred to the "sacred cult of Christianity".³ Ascetics, monks and saints played a major role in the formation, spread and standardisation of Christianity to various parts of the world. It is therefore not surprising that early Christian practice carries with it many elements of the lives of the early monks and ascetics until these were modified, finding different implementations in various parts of the Christian world. The essence and the point of departure remained the same and were much more similar at this early stage in the east and the west.⁴

The early ascetics and monks were men, and less commonly, women, who were the only access for regular people to the divine, in much the same way as relics. Saints intervened on behalf of and for the salvation of the sick, the poor and the needy. The proof of the saints' share in holiness came with miracles which were unmistakably solid, physical testimonies of God's selection and approval.

Miracles took various forms; in many instances they concerned the healing of diseases, genetic disorders, paralysis, deafness, eye complaints, leprosy, digestive disorders, cancer, infection, injury, mental disorders, as well as exorcisms of people "possessed" by the demons.⁵ In the life of Euthymios we learn about the saint who, trying to escape from the villagers, ended up hiding at Mount Arda, and then passed over to the desert where he

³ Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine*, trans. Av. Cameron and S. G. Hall (London and New York, 1999), p. 104.

⁴ On the rise of the importance of the ascetics/monks/saints see, P. Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (Massachusetts, 1996), pp. 72-73 where he draws attention to the aftermath of this development as well as its nature: "The rise to prominence of the Christian monks was a signal. It announced wider changes in Late Roman culture and society... The sharpness of the challenge was summed up in the person of the monks.... The monks could utter *gros mots* that broke the spell of *paideia*.... The 'God-taught' wisdom of the monks of Egypt was so important to Christian contemporaries because it was held to be an avatar of the first, spirit filled spirit of 'fishermen, publicans and the tentmaker'-the apostles and St Paul- for 'God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise.' " See also *idem.*, *Authority and the Sacred* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 17-18 where he refers to the Christianisation of the society in the fourth century, and its relation with the monks; *idem.*, *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago, 1981), as well as his *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, (Berkeley, 1982), pp. 115-152, where he refers to the possible reasons for the rise of the holy men in society.

⁵ J. Seiber distinguishes the miracles performed in cities and the countryside. For a chart of the disorders encountered in major town and cities of the empire see her chart in J. Seiber, *Early Byzantine Urban Saints* BAR. 37 (1997), pp. 97-98. Seiber also refers to the changes in the roles of the saints in society clearly stating that after the seventh century the saints were attached to monastic communities and were more instrumental in land feuds and political struggles, unlike the early saints to whom she devotes her study. See *ibid.*, p. 113.

eventually founded his monastery. After his death the monastery became a shrine for the sick people imploring him to intercede with God in their name: "You yourself, venerable father, must entreat God for us, for we have faith that the Lord listens to your prayer; for 'he does the will of those who fear him.'"⁶ Similarly, in the *Life of St Theodore of Sykeon*, when the saint was in Constantinople living near the quarter of Euaranai/Varanas, one of the wealthy women of the neighbourhood brought her blind child to be healed.⁷ Overall, miracle accounts provide important details about the society, its make-up, relations between the rulers and the ruled, the rich and the poor. They possess valuable information about everyday lives of people from all walks of life, from the poor peasant in remote parts of Palestine to the emperor in Constantinople.⁸

The first recorded ascetic is St Antony whose *vita* was written around the middle of the fourth century by Athanasios, three-time patriarch of Alexandria.⁹ Antony was born in Egypt, became an ascetic monk in the desert in ca. 271, and assembled disciples from ca. 305 onwards: "And so from then on there were monasteries in the mountains and the desert was made a city by the monks, who left their own people and registered themselves for citizenship in the heavens".¹⁰ The main elements of asceticism were put into words for the first time. The everyday life of an ascetic was extremely austere, for he scorned the body and its needs, aspiring for the "nourishment" of the soul rather than that of the body.¹¹ One had to control one's basic needs including food and drink; there was no room for passion, love and anger. Considering all its aspirations this was a world for those with sincere devotion and ability to resist the traps laid by the devil: "For we have terrible and villainous enemies...the mob of them is great in the air around us, and they are not far from us".¹² The monk had to be alert,

⁶ Cyril of Scythopolis. *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. R. M. Price (Kalamazoo, 1991), pp. 17-18 and 35.

⁷ *Three Byzantine Saints*, trans. E. Dawes and N.H. Baynes (Oxford, 1948), p. 152. Greek text and French translation in A.-J. Festugière. *Œuvres de Théodore de Sykéon*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1970), I, p. 93.

⁸ The literature is insurmountably large. D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City* (Oxford, 1966); Palladius, *Stories of the Holy Fathers being the Stories of the Anchorites, Recluses, Monks, Coenobites and Ascetic Fathers of the Deserts of Egypt between ca. 250-400 A.D.*, trans. E.W. Budge (London, 1934); *Three Byzantine Saints; The Lives of the Desert Fathers*. *The Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, trans. N. Russell (Mowbray, 1992); John Moschos, *The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. J. Wortley (Kalamazoo, 1992); Cyril of Scythopolis; *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, trans. S. Brock and S. Ashbrook-Harvey (Berkeley, 1987) and E. A. Clark, "Authority and Humility: A Conflict of Values in Fourth Century Female Monasticism", *ByzF* 9 (1985), pp. 17-33 to cite a few. For the implementation of *vitae* in deciphering norms in a society, in this particular case the Byzantine society of the seventh century, see M. Kaplan, "Les sanctuaires de Theodore de Sykéon", in *Les saints et leur sanctuaires à Byzance*, eds., C. Jolivet-Lévy, M. Kaplan, J.-P. Sordini (Paris, 1993), pp. 65-79.

⁹ Athanasius: *The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*, trans. R. C. Gregg (London, 1980).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

¹¹ For the perception of the human will and body by Christian ascetics see P. Brown, *The Body and Society. Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, 1988), pp. 213-240, in particular.

¹² Athanasius: *The Life of Antony*, p. 47.

since the demons were everywhere. Against the demons the ascetic/monk had to take resort in fasting, prayer and hymn singing. Constant prayer accompanied by manual labour rendered absolute purity to those who wished to ascend the spiritual ladder and attain perfect innocence when man could converse with the beasts of the earth and fowl of the sky as before the Fall.

Antony, therefore, gave up the kingdom of earth for the kingdom of heaven, "for just as if someone might despise one copper drachma in order to gain a hundred gold drachmas, so he who is ruler of the whole earth, and renounces it, loses little, and receives a hundred times more."¹³ Soon, as Athanasios tells us, he gathered brethren around him, Christians who had abandoned their former lives and families and come to the desert to pray and to toil, wishing to become ascetics. He was the father of solitary ascetics, who lived on their own in cells, which they did not leave unless compelled to do so. Monasticism, on the other hand, although it embraced the basic premises of asceticism, differed from it in its emphasis on living among a community of monks. Monasteries –sometimes called *asketeria*– were institutions where asceticism was practiced together with other monks in a communal life (*koinobion*) allotted primarily to prayer and to manual labour necessary for sustenance. St Pachmios is recorded as the first hegoumenos, superior of monks who lived according to the rules of *koinobion*, which entailed gathering together at certain hours of the day for prayer and food before retiring back to individual cells to continue praying in solitude. Pachomios' *vita* is a testimony to the growing number of Christians who wanted to experience monastic life. The increase in their number created a need to regulate monastic life which was devoted to observing a balance between worship, work and sometimes social service like giving alms and caring for the sick and the poor.

Pachomios was born of pagan parents in the Thebaid in Egypt ca. 292. He was a conscript soldier when he first started his monastic career after receiving baptism around 313, when he went to Palamon. He later settled in Tabennesi. He received his first disciples around 324, founded a number of monasteries and convents until his death in ca. 346. Unlike Antony, who was a solitary ascetic, Pachomios, being a hegoumenos, had to supervise a group of monks. For the first time with Pachomios we learn about the division of labour among the monks, all of whom were ultimately placed under the surveillance of the hegoumenos. Presumably, Pachomios' monastery had a rule, which regulated the liturgy, since in the *vita* there are references that point to its existence.¹⁴ In addition, there is enough evidence

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁴ For example: "They lived in a cenobitic life. So he established for them an irreproachable life-style and traditions profitable for their souls. These he took from the scriptures: proper measure in clothing, equality in

concerning the sources of wealth of the monastery since, after Pachomios' death, during Theodore's hegoumenate, the size of the monastery grew together with its wealth, having acquired many fields and boats for trafficking along the Nile which worried Theodore, for "many of the brothers were beginning to alter the way of the life of the ancient brothers," being burdened by worldly possessions.¹⁵

Athanasios, Antony and Pachomios had great impact on the establishment and spread of asceticism and monasticism as it is expressed by Theodore at the end of Pachomios' *vita*: "In our generation in Egypt I see three important things that increase by God's grace: Athanasios, Antony and Pachomios".¹⁶ Following in their footsteps almost all the great Christian figures of the fourth century, like Palladios, St Basil of Caesarea, St Jerome and Rufinus, became monks who at some point in their careers visited the monasteries in Egypt and Palestine. However, once out of the desert, the monks had to comply with indigenous rules and habits. For that matter, although in principle monasticism belonged to the desert, after the fourth century, it took different forms outside Egypt and Palestine.

'But you don't have to come to the middle of the desert to find an empty room free from distractions. You can find that anywhere: in Cairo, or Alex, or London...'

'What you say is true,' said Fr. Dioscouros with a smile. 'You can pray anywhere. After all, God is everywhere, so you can find him everywhere.' He gestured to the darkening sand dunes outside: 'But in the desert, in the pure clean atmosphere, in the silence – there you can find *yourself*. And unless you begin to know yourself, how can you even begin to search for God?'¹⁷

Ideals remain ideals forever as the above lines from a recent pilgrimage illustrate. For monks and ascetics the ideal was to dwell in a solitary cell as far from the nearest human conglomeration as possible. John Moschos' *Spiritual Meadow* (late sixth century) is an account of the ascetics and monks he met during his trips to the Thebaid, the Oasis and Mt Sinai, where he stayed for ten years before returning to his home monastery of St Theodosios in Bethlehem. Among others he refers to John the Elder who, refusing the proposal of the Archbishop of Jerusalem to become hegoumenos of a monastery, continued to live in a cave at Capsas.¹⁸ There is another story about an elder who slept in a cave with lions. Almost all the references to towns and cities are negative, since these represented the inhabited world,

food and decent sleeping arrangements." *Pachomian Koinonia*, trans. A. Veilleux, vol. I (Kalamazoo, 1980), p. 313, as well as p. 335 where "the rule of the *koinobia*" is mentioned.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 405-407.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 395.

¹⁷ Father Dioscouros to William Dalrymple at St Antony's, Egypt, 11 December, 1994. W. Dalrymple, *From the Holy Mountain. A Journey in the Shadow of Byzantium* (London, 1997), p. 410. His pilgrimage following in the footsteps of Moschos to the monasteries of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, started June 1994.

the *oikoumene*, whereas the ideal monk should "avoid studiously over-much contact with the world."¹⁹ All the monasteries he had visited were founded outside the *oikoumene*; the monastery of St Sergios, for example, was "near holy Bethlehem, about two miles away;" the monastery of Abba John the Eunuch was at the ninth mile post from Alexandria; Abba Broucha found "a spot in the wilderness outside the city of Seleucia near Antioch and tried to build a small cell there."²⁰ Cyril of Skythopolis, another sixth century pilgrim-monk (and later saint), mentions Abramios, who later became bishop of Craeta, close to the border between Bithynia and Paphlagonia. Although he made an excellent bishop who cared for the flock and built many hospitals, orphanages and churches, when he remembered the days when "he was an ascetic in the monastery of Scholarius, was deeply grieved and vexed at seeing himself at the destruction and turmoil and the cares of life."²¹ We are not far from what Sozomen wrote about St Antony, the first ascetic: "as fish are nourished in the water, so the desert is the place prepared for the monks; and as fish die when thrown upon dry lands, so monastics lose their gravity when they go into cities."²² One should note, however, in the early fifth century when Sozomen was writing these lines, there were already a number of monasteries in the city where he lived, Constantinople. Hence, in the fourth century monks left Egypt, Palestine and Syria. Monasticism literally "spread" to various places in both the east and the west. But, why?

To answer the question of why monasteries were founded outside the desert with relative speed from the early fourth century onwards, one must answer in the first place why the monks left Egypt and Syria at that particular time in history. This requires a better knowledge about Egypt, Syria and Palestine in the late third and early fourth centuries.²³ If monks and ascetics were well received in villages, towns and cities outside Egypt and Palestine, and found recognition as well as respect, this cannot be due to any factor other than intensified Christianisation. Their victory was the victory of Christianity against the openly professed enemy of paganism and certain aspects of late antique values and life-style. About

¹⁸ John Moschos, *The Spiritual Meadow*, p. 4.

¹⁹ For negative references to urban dwellings, see *ibid.*, pp. 38, 52-56, 95, 127, 140-141.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 151, 153 and 164.

²¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, p. 277.

²² Sozomen, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, trans. P. Schaff, (repr. Edinburgh, 1997), vol II, I, xiii, p. 249.

²³ So far only Syrian asceticism has been studied. See A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient. A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, 3 vols. (Louvain, 1958-1988). See also F. R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianisation c. 370-529*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1993), especially vol I; S. Ashbrook-Harvey, "The Holy and the Poor: Models from early Syriac Christianity" in *Through the Eye of a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. E. Albu Hanawalt, C. Lindberg (Kirkville, 1994), pp. 43-66.

three hundred years after the birth of Christ, his message was finally ready to expand and conquer the inhabited world that lay beyond the desert and the wilderness.

If what made the spread of monasticism possible was growing Christianisation, then what made it possible for monasticism to expand beyond Egypt and Palestine was the association between these monks and wealthy members of Late Roman society. It was due to the latter that monasteries were founded outside the lands where monasticism was born. They were the ones who could afford to travel to distant lands, undertaking pilgrimage, which lasted many years and required a substantial amount of wealth. Eventually, thanks to the support they rendered by bestowing large tracts of land or property, the monks were able to establish monasteries at "home". Hence, it was this collaboration between the monks and the aristocrats or well-to-do members of the laity that made it possible for monasticism to flourish outside Egypt and the Holy Land.

Early *vitae* provide abundant information on the role of the aristocrats in late antique society. Both the poor and the wealthy believed in the saints' powers which prove God's approval; however, it was city governors, members of the provincial administration, and aristocrats, especially women, who influenced the course of events in the life of the monk/saint. The *vita* of St Thekla of Seleukeia exemplifies the case. Being from a wealthy family in Chonai, she decided to leave her home and family when one day behind the lattice of her parents' house she heard St Paul preaching to the common folk. Her *vita* abounds in instances where she is troubled by leading members of the cities she visits; in fact, she attempts suicide when the governor of Seleukeia wants to marry her. However, her resolution and commitment finally bear fruit, she converts many to Christianity and has followers among the rich, particularly wealthy women. Through their promotion she finds greater recognition among the newly emerging Christian population of Seleukeia, Tarsus and the surrounding areas. No less a person than emperor Zeno built for her "the *martyrion*" where people flocked from various parts of the empire to find comfort for their troubles.²⁴ The relationship between the saint and the local communities, in particular the aristocrats, can also be observed in many of the *vitae* written in the centuries that postdate St Thekla's *vita*.²⁵

Similarly, pilgrimage, or "therapy by distance" as Peter Brown calls it, was mainly an aristocratic enterprise. A quick glance at the early pilgrims proves this point. The earliest

²⁴ G. Dagron, ed. and trans., *Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle. Texte grec, traduction et commentaire* (Brussels, 1978).

²⁵ For a general survey of urban saints from the fifth to the ninth centuries, see D. Z. de F. Abrahamse, *Hagiographic Sources for Byzantine Cities 500-900 AD.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1967.

record of Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land dates from the first half of the fourth century. Interestingly, women pilgrims loom large among the first pilgrims, though not surprisingly all are highly aristocratic (if not imperial) women mainly from Rome. Egeria's family had large estates throughout the Mediterranean which made it relatively easy for her to travel from Rome to Jerusalem between 381 and 384, some fifty years after the Bordeaux pilgrim.²⁶ Her account is an early testimony also to the importance of the monks in mapping the topography of the Holy Land. At every step she was accompanied by monks. It was an invaluable spiritual experience for her to join services at the church built on exactly the same place where Christ was crucified, as well as at the site of his tomb, where he was resurrected.²⁷ Another wealthy Christian aristocrat was Melania the Elder, from a family of Roman consuls, who, having been widowed at an early age, left Rome in the 370s for the Mount of Olives, where, assisted by Rufinus of Aquelia, she founded monasteries and convents in the ten years following her arrival.²⁸ Her grand-daughter Melania the Younger was forced to marry Pinian, her cousin and ex-prefect of Rome, at the age of 16, with whom she had two children who later like their mother chose to enter monasteries. Melania founded two monasteries on the lands that belonged to her family. Between 417 and 431, she was in Jerusalem, where she founded a convent after the death of her mother and a monastery following the death of her husband. Through Empress Eudokia she was related to the imperial family in Constantinople, where she arrived in 436 before setting off for the last time for Jerusalem where she died in 440.²⁹ Rufinus' one-time friend turned life-long enemy, Jerome, is associated with a number of rich ladies who decided to embrace the monastic life, among whom Paula is possibly the most famous. In her *enkomion*, Jerome boasts about her aristocratic background, going back to the family of Atreus. Paula, like Melania and Egeria, left Rome for the Holy Land in about 385 and founded monasteries, the leadership of which she later devolved upon her close relatives.³⁰ On the imperial side, one should not fail to mention the mother of Constantine, empress Helena, whose pilgrimage to Jerusalem played an important role in the promotion of

²⁶ *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*, trans. J. Wilkinson (Jerusalem and Warminster, 1981).

²⁷ For the importance of monks as guides to pilgrims and their influence on pilgrims, as well as importance in mapping the Holy Land, see H. S. Sivan, "Pilgrimage, Monasticism and the Emergence of Christian Palestine in the Fourth Century", in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout (Urbana and Chicago, 1990), pp. 54-65; and J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 84-85. For the roles of emperors, especially Constantine I and Theodosios II, and the aristocrats at the court, as well as members of the imperial family, see E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Roman Empire AD 312-460* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 28-49, 158-179 in particular.

²⁸ E. A. Clark, "Authority and Humility: A Conflict of Values in Fourth Century Female Monasticism", *ByzF* 9 (1985), pp. 17-33.

²⁹ For Melania the Younger, see E. Malamut, *Sur la route des saintes byzantines* (Paris, 1993), pp. 14-15.

³⁰ For Paula, see *ibid.*, p. 23.

holy sites. The Holy Land would eventually change the facet of urban life. Through the translation of relics into churches and *martyria*, new holy lands were created in cities, primarily at Rome and Constantinople.³¹

³¹ Wilkinson casts some doubt upon Helena's pilgrimage because it is not recorded by Eusebios, Egeria or Chrysostomos. The first mention is by St Ambrose in his sermon on the death of Theodosios I in 395, where he mentions that the Empress found three pieces of the Holy Cross alongside its title, together with the two nails. See *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*, pp. 240-241. There are three legends on the discovery of the True Cross, including the one involving Helena. All three legends "originated, developed and circulated" after the 350s. See H. J.W. and J.W. Drijvers, trans., *The Finding of the True Cross, The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*, CSCO Subidia 93 (Louvain, 1997), pp. 11-14.

III. From the Desert to the "Oikoumene": Aspects of Byzantine Monasticism.

Monasticism in Asia Minor and mainland Greece, what I refer to as Byzantine monasticism, showed variations in practice from that practiced in Egypt and Syria and elsewhere. Since Egypt and Syria, as well as Rome, were part of the Empire, scholars who have written on monasticism in the Byzantine Empire inevitably start their survey from where we have started, with the first ascetics and monks in Egypt, namely St Antony and St Pachomios.³² However, the way the term is used in this work is more restricted. By the term Byzantium I refer specifically to Asia Minor and mainland Greece with Constantinople at their head. With "Byzantine monasticism" I refer to the monasticism that developed specifically in these parts of the empire. However, one should keep in mind that this division is rather artificial and is for the sake of clarifying the geographic focus of this work alone. Otherwise, especially in the early period, there is more continuity, similarity and amalgamation than acute differences between the eastern (i.e. Egyptian and Syrian) monastic/ascetic practices and the monasticism in Asia Minor, Constantinople and Greece which is marked by "its very *lack* of clearly defined forms".³³ We have to note in addition that even the term Byzantine monasticism does not capture reality because, though more unified, monastic practices in Asia Minor, Constantinople and Greece showed variations as well.

Overall, Byzantine monasticism retained its essentially aristocratic character from the fourth to the fifteenth century. Early monks came from the east and established their monasteries on lands accorded them by the aristocrats. Increasingly after the fifth century, monasticism was largely a vocation for the children of wealthy families. In fact, the renunciation of the world despite a promising future is a much-valued theme in Byzantine hagiography. Alexander Akoimetos' family moved to Constantinople, where the saint received his education, and later served in the troops belonging to the Praetorian Prefect. Markellinos Akoimetos had a considerable income from his parents; St John the Hesychast from Nikopolis in Armenia belonged to a rich family with members serving at the imperial court in Constantinople. St Hypatios' father was a *scholastikos*. In the seventh and eighth centuries the dominance of the wealthy continued. Saints (and monks of course) Michael the Synkellos, Andrew of Crete, Stephen of Sougdaia, George Dekapolites and George of Amastris were all from rich families. In Constantinople, Nikephoros of Medikion,

³² Like J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 335-349 and C. Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (London, 1980), pp. 105-124.

³³ R. Morris, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium 843-1118* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 33. For a detailed analysis see *ibid.*, pp. 9-63.

Theophanes the Confessor, the renowned St Theodore the Stoudite, his uncle Platon, brother Joseph as well as Makarios of Pelekete belonged to the upper levels of the society.³⁴ Only in the ninth century do we start to hear about monks and saints from relatively modest backgrounds. The change, according to Malamut, was directly related to the alteration in the audience of the *vitae*, that is, after the ninth century more people from the lower classes started to read them.³⁵ One should add that this reflected a major change in the evolution of Byzantine monasticism, since, after the ninth century, monasticism became an integral part of Byzantine society. This, however, should not be associated with a single - though major - figure of the ninth century, namely, Theodore of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople, but should rather be seen as a consequence of internal developments moulded largely after the period of Iconoclasm. One good indicator of the rise in the status of the monks is the growth in the number of patriarchs who came from monastic backgrounds. By the end of the ninth century it was common practice for patriarchs of Constantinople to start their careers as monks before being appointed to the highest ecclesiastical position of the empire. Once begun, this trend continued to the fifteenth century. Pyrrhos in 638 and Theodore in 677 were previously hegoumenoi of monasteries.³⁶ According to Bréhier, between 705 and 1204, 45 out of 57 patriarchs originated from the ranks of monks.³⁷ If this is put together with Dagron's central argument that patriarchs of Constantinople had authority over ecclesiastical matters particularly after the seventh century, which they *did not* share with the emperor, the increase in the importance of the monks becomes obvious.³⁸

Following the period of Iconoclasm, in the ninth century monastic life in Byzantium acquired its distinctive character marked by increased imperial patronage, which added new colour to its essentially aristocratic character. In fact, one can talk about *Byzantine* monasticism especially after the ninth century, since it is from the ninth and tenth centuries onwards that monasticism in Byzantium developed specific characteristics that differentiated it more distinctly from, say, western monasticism.³⁹

³⁴ Some of these saints will be dealt with in detail below. For an overall view of the "social milieu" of Byzantine saints, see Malamut, *Sur la route*, pp. 62-68. On a general evaluation of the backgrounds of Byzantine authors between the ninth and eleventh centuries, see A. Kazhdan and G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 101-102.

³⁵ Malamut, *Sur la route*, pp. 67-68.

³⁶ G. Dagron, "L'église et la chrétienté byzantines entre invasions et l'Iconoclasm", in *Histoire du Christianisme*, eds. J.-M. Mayeur, Ch. and L. Pietri, A. Vauchez and M. Venard, vol. 4 (610-1054) (Paris, 1993), p. 35.

³⁷ Cited in P. Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society", *DOP* 25 (1971), p. 84.

³⁸ G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin* (Paris, 1996).

³⁹ According to Laurent, the period between 780-1200 was the golden age of Byzantine monasticism. Charanis agrees on the whole, but adds that intensification in the number of foundations took place between the ninth and

Byzantine monasticism retained its aristocratic character from the beginning, with the introduction of imperial patronage this was only perpetuated. After the tenth century, the problem for the imperial administration revolved around the administration and control of monastic wealth, since it had become a tool for the wealthy members of the society to transfer patrimony to the coming generations with tax exemptions and immunity against the threat of confiscation. At the same time, particularly the monasteries near or in large urban centres, above all those monasteries in Constantinople, took on the duty of "philanthropia", assisting the poor and the sick which helped legitimise the wealth of the founders in the eyes of the urban masses.⁴⁰

In addition, Byzantine monasticism was essentially communal in character. In fourth century terminology, this was closer to that envisioned and organised by St Pachomios although Byzantines always respected the solitaries and the ascetics like St Antony. This is evidenced in the works of St Basil of Caesarea (c. 330-379). He was educated at Caesarea, Constantinople and Athens in the best schools of the Empire in a both pagan and Christian environment. Forsaking the world for monastic life, he settled as a hermit by the Iris river not far from his home town in Annesi. Basil wrote his famous *Rule* in 358-364. It regulates the initial premises of joining the monastery and admission to a monastic community and also covers details of monastic life ranging from prayer, clothing, meals and manual work to the earthly relationships including these with the other monasteries and the Church. It also contains a section on the duties of monastic officials. Although strict, the *Rule* avoids the more extreme austerities of the ascetics of the desert, advising a more moderate type of religious life in a community under the direct authority of the hegoumenos. Basil's *Rule*, therefore, is exemplary of Byzantine monasticism with its emphasis on communal life and consideration for the greater community outside the walls of the monastery which is shown through social services like caring for the poor and educating children.⁴¹ In addition, there was always room for flexibility. Some of the elder monks did become solitaries and practised strict *askesis*. However, even then they remained within the boundary of the rules of *koinobion*. This was very different from the practices in Egypt where hermits were scattered around the desert and never left their cells unless compelled to do so. It also differed from the type of monasticism practiced in Syria and Palestine where hermits would gather at least once

thirteenth centuries with slight decline during the tenth century, due largely to the reforms of Romanos II and Basil II. See Charanis, "The Monk", pp. 67-68. On aristocratic and imperial patronage after the tenth century, see Morris, *Monks and Laymen*, pp. 138-142 as well as the appendix pp. 296-297.

⁴⁰ On philanthropy and monasteries, see D. J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare* (New Brunswick, 1968), pp. 88-110.

a week on Sundays for service and on special occasions like feast days. Similarly, in Byzantium *laura* and *kellia* were terms used for monasteries in rural areas and never for urban monasteries. Even a rural monastery was generally referred to as *phrondisterion*, *mone*, *monasterion* or *koinobion*, reflecting the communal character of Byzantine monasteries, which they retained throughout the centuries.⁴²

Finally, just as they were communal in their organisation, Byzantine monasteries were established closer to communities; they were not far from human sites of habitation. For example, Sozomen contrasts Egyptian and Syrian monasticism with the practice in Byzantium:

[Egypt] "They call this place Nitria. It is inhabited by a great number of persons devoted to a life of philosophy...It contains about fifty monasteries, built tolerably near each other, some of which are inhabited by monks who live together in a society, and others by monks who have adopted a solitary mode of existence. More in the interior of the desert, about seventy stadia from this locality, is another place called Cellia, throughout which numerous little dwellings are dispersed hither and thither, and hence its name; but at such a distance that those who dwell in them can neither see nor hear each other....Those who dwell in the cells are those who have attained the summit of philosophy, and who are therefore able to regulate their own conduct, to live alone, and are separated from others for the sake of quietude...

...Let us pass thence to Syria and Persia...We shall find that the monks of these countries emulated those of Egypt...When they first entered upon the philosophic career, they were denominated shepherds, because they had no houses, ate neither bread nor meat, and drank no wine; but dwelt constantly on the mountains, and passed their time in praising God...At the usual hour of meals they each took a sickle, and went to the mountain to cut some grass on the mountains, as though they were flocks in pasture...

...I suppose that Galatia, Cappadocia and the neighbouring provinces contained many other ecclesiastical philosophers at that time, for these regions formerly had zealously embraced the doctrine. *These monks for the most part dwelt in communities in cities and villages, for they did not habituate themselves to the tradition of their predecessors. The severity of the winter...would probably make a hermit life impracticable...*"⁴³

Sozomen notes the difference between the two types of monasticism and admits that the "traditional" monasticism was practiced in Egypt and Palestine. He also adds that monasticism in Byzantium was practised quite differently, being urban in essence. The relationship of the monasteries with the *oikoumene* was not totally broken, which was the case for the monasteries especially of Egypt. This was largely due to the significant difference between the natural conditions in these regions as opposed to Asia Minor, where there was not a sharp contrast between the *oikoumene* and the *eremos*; settlement and non-settlement

⁴¹ W.K. Lowther-Clarke, *St. Basil the Great. A Study in Byzantine Monasticism* (Cambridge, 1913).

⁴² For general discussion see D. Papachryssanthou, "La vie monastique dans les campagnes byzantines, du VIIIe au XIe siècle", *Byzantion* 43 (1973), pp. 158-180.

were closely knit in the Byzantine landscape.⁴⁴ Hence, although the notion of absolute *eremia* was idealised and longed for, the Byzantine monks were never totally isolated from the rest of the society. To a certain extent this is true for most of the monasteries of Cappadocia, the Black Sea, Olympos, Auxentios, Patmos, Latros, Galesion, Athos and Meteora. Herein lies the reason why Byzantine monks had to create pseudo-deserts within the walls of their monasteries and cells. The urban monastery was not unusual in Byzantium. Bryer, having examined a total of about 700 monasteries throughout the existence of the Byzantine Empire, surmised that Byzantine monasticism was rather an urban issue: "the Byzantine monastery had moved from the desert to the city, and more particularly to The City." In fact, it was common practice for rural monasteries of Byzantium to maintain *metochia* (hostels) in Constantinople, mainly to benefit from proximity to the imperial presence.⁴⁵

⁴³ Sozomen, chapters xxxii-xxxv, pp. 369-371. The italics are mine.

⁴⁴ On this see Brown, *Society and the Holy*, pp. 110-111.

⁴⁵ A. Bryer, "The Late Byzantine Monastery in Town and Countryside" in *The Church in Town and Countryside* ed. D. Baker, SCH 16 (1979), pp. 222-223. See also P. Charanis, "The Monk", pp. 64-65.

IV. Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople: The Early Centuries

"....Keep out of cities and you will never lose your vocation....Had the scenes of the Passion and of the Resurrection been elsewhere than in a populous city with court and a garrison, with prostitutes, play actors and buffoons, and with the medley of persons usually found in all cities; or had the crowds which thronged it been composed of monks; then a city would be a desirable abode for those who have embraced the monastic life. But as things are, it would be the height of folly, first to renounce the world, to forswear one's country, to forsake cities, to profess oneself a monk, and then to have lived among still greater numbers the same kind of life that you would have lived in your own country. Men rush here from all quarters of the world, the city is filled with people of every race, and so great is the throng of men and women, that what you used partially to escape elsewhere, you must here put up with in its entirety."⁴⁶

Constantinople was not a Christian city when it was first officially dedicated in May 330. Images from antiquity filled its streets and porticoes. They were actually brought in to the city by the founder himself, although Eusebios implies that Constantine brought the Pythian and Sminthian Apollos, the tripods and Serpent Column from Delphi and the Heliconian muses so that they would serve "as laughing stock for the masses".⁴⁷ To the contrary, Constantine most probably bothered to have them transported all the way to his new city because he appreciated *at least* their aesthetic value. In fact, not before the eighth century did the antique statues, columns, porticoes, etc. start losing their urban context. One could read the eighth-century *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* as the work of a much confused Constantinopolitan with an ironic pen, wondering what meaning(s) to give to the city and the monuments of its past as they were slowly falling apart.

Wherever Constantine's sympathies lay in matters concerning faith, he possibly was not the passionate Christian Eusebios portrays. Eusebios attributes to him the foundation of "very many places of worship, very large martyr-shrines, and splendid houses...By these he at the same time honoured the tombs of the martyrs and consecrated the city to the martyr's God".⁴⁸ Nevertheless, apart from St Akakios, St Irene and St Mokios, most of the churches in fact belonged to later centuries.⁴⁹ Concerning the last point too, that is, about the consecration

⁴⁶ J. Stevenson. *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church AD 337-461*, revised ed. W.H.C. Frend (London, 1989), pp. 189-190. The quotation is from St Jerome, who wrote as follows on the attractions of cities, in this particular case the attractions of his home city, Rome: "How often when I was living in the desert, in the vast solitude which gives to hermits a savage dwelling place, parched by a burning sun, how often did I fancy myself among the pleasures of Rome!" *ibid.*, p. 179.

⁴⁷ *Life of Constantine*, p. 143.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁴⁹ C. Mango. *Le développement urbain de Constantinople IV^e-VII^e siècles* (Paris, 1985), pp. 35-36. If one accepts that the main basilica was started under Constantine, in total four churches are dated to his reign.

of the city to God, Eusebios seems to be wrong: Constantine was more a Roman than a Christian emperor, and like Hadrian, who after rebuilding Jerusalem named it Aelia Capitolina, so did Constantine refer to the new city after his own name.⁵⁰ Constantinople was not Theoupolis, unlike Antioch after the earthquake of 528,⁵¹ but Nea Roma with its Tyche brought from Rome by Constantine himself. In this context one should not fail to mention an inscription in Syria referring to a magnificent temple dedicated to the Sun-God, which was built under Constantine.⁵² On the other hand, the first ecumenical council convened at Nicaea in 325 at Constantine's instigation. Wherever his preferences lay, Constantine went down in history as the first Christian emperor, an honour which he owes more to the rise of Christianity, his successors and ultimately to the Christian chroniclers and historians, than to his own pious acts.⁵³

Constantine's initial efforts, however, did bear fruit and the city became the major center of the east, rivalling Rome not long after its foundation, for example, at the Council of Constantinople in 381, when Constantinople made its first attempt to evade Roman claims over supremacy. Why and how was this brought about with such speed? How was it possible that Rome and the west looked to Constantinople for religious inspiration -and not vice versa- throughout the early centuries? It seems that bishops and monks "imported" from the east to Constantinople played a major role in this development. After all, for religious inspiration everybody looked to the east in the third and fourth centuries. However, Constantinople was a convergence point between the east and the west. It is particularly on this issue that Constantine's role should be emphasised. He managed to create a physical structure for the city that was suitable and attractive first to the wealthy and second, to eastern monks and ascetics. Without the two coming together, which I think even in Rome did not occur as fast as it did in Constantinople, it would have taken much longer for Christianity to become the major religion asserting its values over the existing institutions of the empire. Christianisation of Constantinopolitan institutions and topography coalesces with the Christianisation of the

⁵⁰ On Jerusalem, see F. E. Peters, *Jerusalem. The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton, 1985), especially p. 129 on Hadrian's rebuilding after the revolt of the Jews in ca. 130.

⁵¹ W. E. Metcalf, "The Mint of Antioch," in *Antioch. The Lost Ancient City*, ed. C. Kondoleon (Princeton, 2000), p. 111.

⁵² Vööbus, *History of Asceticism*, vol. II, p. 347.

⁵³ According to Dagron, Christianisation of the empire starts from the reign of Theodosios I. Following his reign, there is no toleration (in legislation) not only for paganism but also for heresy within the city as well as in the empire. By the fifth century the people of Constantinople are referred to as "*philochristos demos*", the city as "*philochristos polis*". One should note, however, that those who refer to the city by that name were Gregory of Nazianzos and John Chrysostomos. See G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974), pp. 382-387.

empire, which in turn corresponds to the era when the monks and ascetics in the east were leaving their caves and cells; all took place precisely in the fourth century. This seems to be more than just a coincidence.

By the end of the reign of Constantine, the major sites of monumental value in Constantinople were either begun or completed. The Acropolis was the site of the palace and the central church of the city, which, if begun under Constantine in 326, was completed during the reign of his son and successor Constantius. Monuments transported from various places embellished the hippodrome, whose Severan origin has recently been challenged. Thus, the palace, the senate, the central basilica, the forum and the mausoleum were completed during his reign. The city was encircled by Constantinian land walls having a Golden Gate located at the Capitolium which, compared with the later situation at the Theodosian city, served as the focal point of an "inverted" ceremonial program. In addition to the natural harbour along the Golden Horn, Constantinople had a number of additional harbours along the southern coast facing the Propontis.⁵⁴ Wealthy aristocrats, originating primarily from Rome, built houses on the remaining area within the walls and *proasteia* outside the walls. In this as well Constantine did not leave things to chance. He rendered the city attractive for settlement to the rich populace of the empire. One of the benefits Constantinople offered was reserved for those who owned or built a house, which gave access to *panis aedium*, free bread allotments, made explicit in the law dating from 369: "The Roman citizens...shall now obtain thirty-six ounces in six loaves of fine bread without payment, in such a way that no right shall be held in this distribution to any apparitor, any slave, or any person who obtains the bread rations due to a house".⁵⁵ Being close to the imperial presence, to the senate, to the center where all decisions were taken, was, of course, another source of attraction, and certainly not a minor one. If one considers the names of the quarters in the early city, it becomes obvious that Constantine did in fact achieve his primary goal and populated the city, enticing primarily the wealthy members of the empire to the city that was

⁵⁴ For a detailed analysis of "the city of Constantine", see Mango, *Le développement*, pp.23-36. For early monuments in Constantinople, especially for attribution of the earliest basilica to Constantius rather than Constantine, see T. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park and London, 1971), p. 11; for Holy Apostles and the mausoleum of Constantine in particular and imperial mausolea at the site in general, see P. Grierson, "The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors (337-1042)", *DOP* 16 (1962), pp. 1-63. For the hippodrome and the argument against its Severan origin, see A. Berger, "Streets and Public Spaces in Constantinople", *DOP* 54 (2000) p. 165, where he argues convincingly that it was built towards the end of the third century. For Constantine's Golden Gate and the "inverted" ceremonial, see Mango, "The Triumphal Way of Constantinople and the Golden Gate", *DOP* 54 (2000), pp. 173-188.

⁵⁵ CTh 14.17.5, p. 418 following the law issued in 364.

already giving signs of a promising future at this early stage.⁵⁶ Most of these quarters bear the names of the people who built houses in each particular area. This phenomenon is not limited to the reign of Constantine but extends to that of his successors. A brief glance at the names of the city's quarters is also instrumental in seeing the role of the aristocrats, who came from different parts of the empire, in formulating the Christian topography of Constantinople.⁵⁷

The early Constantinopolitan aristocracy can roughly be divided into three groups. First come the members of the senatorial aristocracy from Rome, followed by aristocrats originating from the major cities of the empire, especially from the eastern cities, primarily Antioch.⁵⁸ The court officials, among whom the eunuchs of eastern origins had greater involvement in the foundation of monasteries, constitute the third group.

Let us start with Ablabios, governor of Crete before he was made the praetorian prefect of the east in 329. He came to Constantinople in 330 possibly for the dedication of the city on 11 May and was made consul in 331. He owned estates in Bithynia and at least one house in Constantinople, which later became the property of Placidia (Galla), wife of Theodosios I. A quarter in the city, *ta Ablabiou*, possibly located in the vicinity of the church of SS Sergios and Backhos, takes its name from his house. He is also important in showing us the relationship between the aristocrats and the early monasteries in the city, for he was the father of St Olympias, founder of one of the first convents in Constantinople. Olympias was supported in her decision by the greatest Christian figure of the late fourth/early fifth century, St John Chrysostomos, the only person who was accorded permission to enter her convent.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ See also the reference in Sozomen: "... In obedience to the words of God, he [Constantine] therefore enlarged the city formerly called Byzantium and surrounded it with high walls. He also erected magnificent dwelling houses southward through the regions. Since he was aware that the former population was insufficient for so great a city, he peopled it with men of rank and their households, whom he summoned hither from the elder Rome and from other countries. He imposed taxes to cover the expenses of building and adorning the city, and of supplying the inhabitants with food, and providing the city with all the other requisites. He adorned it sumptuously with a hippodrome, fountains, porticos and other structures...." *Sozomen*, 2, iii, pp. 259-60.

⁵⁷ For a shorter review of this, see G. Dagron, "Le Christianisme dans la ville byzantine", *DOP* 31 (1977), pp. 8-9. C. Mango, "The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre", in *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993) I, pp. 126-128.

⁵⁸ For the importance of the reign of Constantine for the change in imperial attitude towards the senatorial aristocracy, see M. Arnheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 3-5, 39-73. The changes in the recruitments for and the definition of the status of the members of the senate in Constantinople came in three successive stages. It started with the victory of Constantine over Licinius and was complete by the reign of Valens (and Valentinian in the West). For our purposes the most important aspect of this development was that the senate in Constantinople welcomed rich members of the curial classes in eastern cities. As a result, Constantinople lured not only the senatorial class in Rome but also the urban (curial) rich of the eastern cities in particular through grants of senatorial status, "consolidated into a unified senatorial system of precedence". See P. Heather, "New Men for New Constantines? Creating an Imperial Elite in the Eastern Mediterranean", in *New Constantines, The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries*, ed. P. Magdalino (Aldershot, 1994), pp. 11-33.

⁵⁹ For Ablabios, see *PLRE* I, pp. 3-4; for the quarter *ta Ablabiou*, see R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique* (Paris, 1964), p. 304. For his relation with monasteries in the

Again during the reign of Constantine I, Sallustius, *patrikios*, came from Rome to Constantinople and gave his name to the quarter where his house was built.⁶⁰ Likewise, Aetios was one of these figures who left his home city Antioch for Constantinople, for which he was reprimanded by his famous friend Libanios. He was made senator in Constantinople. One of the cisterns integrated within the new city walls following their construction in 413 was named after him.⁶¹ *Ta Anthemiou* gets its name from the palace built there by the praetorian prefect of the east between 405-411, Anthemios, the same person who built the land walls of Constantinople. This may be true unless the palace belonged to another Anthemios who was made *augustus* of the west after his marriage to the daughter of emperor Marcian.⁶² *Ta Lausou* was the quarter where Lausos, *cubicularius* during the reign of Theodosios II, had his palace, the same person who welcomed Melania the younger when she arrived at Constantinople. In addition, Palladios wrote the *Lausaia History* at Lausos' request while he was in exile in Kyene. His case is important for it exemplifies the relationship between the promotion of Christianity, of the cult of saints and the aristocracy in Constantinople.⁶³

The flow of aristocrats from the west increased especially in the sixth century due to the situation in the west. Between 493 and 536, Goths were ruling in Italy, and economic conditions deteriorated particularly in the north. For the aristocrats originating from northern regions, Constantinople and Sicily were safe havens: therefore, T. S. Brown presumes that most of the senatorial aristocrats who moved to the new capital must have come from Northern Italy.⁶⁴ One of these Roman aristocrats of Gothic origins was Areobindos who gave his name to the Constantinopolitan quarter, *ta Areobindou*. His wife Anicia Juliana, founder of the church of St Polyeuktos, had a very strong claim to the imperial throne through her father, who was emperor of the west. St Polyeuktos, the largest church building in Constantinople after Justinian's Hagia Sophia, was built on her own estate in one of the most aristocratic regions of the city. It retained its focal position in imperial ceremonies until the twelfth century when, for reasons unknown, its site was abandoned, and eventually used as a

city through his daughter, see I. *Olymp.*, p. 410 and p. 414 for the passage where Chrysostomos' privilege is mentioned.

⁶⁰ For the quarter, see Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 421. The information about him is preserved in the *Patria*, according to which he was made prefect of the city in 364. The closest option is Sallustius (4), prefect of the city of Rome in 387. *PLRE* I, p. 797.

⁶¹ *PLRE* I, pp. 25-26; Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 306.

⁶² See Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 309. Janin thinks it was the prefect Anthemios and not the *augustus* who built the palace. For Anthemios (1), see *PLRE* II, pp. 93-94 and *ibid.*, pp. 96-98 for Anthemios 3.

⁶³ *PLRE* II, pp. 660-661; Palladius, *Stories of the Holy Fathers*, pp. 27-28.

⁶⁴ T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers. Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554-800* (Rome, 1984), pp. 23-49.

cemetery.⁶⁵ *Ta Olybriou* refers to the area in the city where the house of Olybrius, Anicia Juliana's father, was situated.⁶⁶ Examples can be extended into the following centuries. *Ta Ourbikiou* received its name from the house of Urbicius, *stratelatos* of the East under Anastasios. His residence situated to the east of the imperial palace housed a "Monophysite monastery" under Justinian, which was transferred there from the palace of Hormisdas which stood to the west of the great palace.⁶⁷ Amantios was *cubicularius* under Anastasios I. According to Prokopios he was murdered because, being a fervent Monophysite he was against the religious policies of the then ruling emperor Justin I. He was quite well known among his contemporaries and must have played an important role in religious debates. He built the church of St Thomas in Constantinople and gave his name to the quarter of *ta Amantiou* on the Propontis coast, not far from the harbour of Sophia.⁶⁸ *Ta Andreou* was the quarter where yet another *cubicularius* of Anastasios had a house at the beginning of the sixth century.⁶⁹ *Ta Anthimou* was named after the *oikos* of Anthimos, patriarch of Constantinople between 535-536.⁷⁰ Likewise *ta Kokorobiou*, which took its name from the house of Kokorobios the prefect was situated in the Lykos valley.⁷¹

It was therefore the preferences of these new, wealthy Constantinopolitans that shaped the city's topography. "If one wants to understand the expansion of the church within the city of Rome itself, it is indispensable that one understands the activities of the Roman urban elites who had mostly turned to Christianity in the late fourth and early fifth centuries," wrote Marazzi.⁷² The same is valid also for Constantinople and for the other cities of the empire. The massive support on the part of the elites partially explains the growing number of

⁶⁵ For the quarter see Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 313. For Anicia Juliana and the St Polyeuktos, see R.M. Harrison, *Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul*, 2 vols. (Princeton and Washington D.C., 1986); *idem.*, *A Temple for Byzantium. The Discovery and Excavation of Anicia Juliana's Palace-Church in Istanbul* (London, 1987). For her likely role in the translation of the relics of St Stephen, see P. Magdalino, "Aristocratic *Oikoi* in the Tenth and Eleventh Regions of Constantinople", in *Byzantine Constantinople. Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life*, ed. N. Necipoğlu (Leiden, 2001), pp. 54-69.

⁶⁶ For Olybrius (3), see *PLRE* II, p. 795.

⁶⁷ Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 400. For the transfer of the monophysite monastery from the palace of Hormisdas to the palace of Urbicius, see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, ed. and trans. E.W. Brooks *PO* 18 (1924), p. 678.

⁶⁸ *PLRE* II, pp. 26-27; Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, pp. 307-308.

⁶⁹ *PLRE* II, p. 89; Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 308. This could as well be the Andreas of the previous century mentioned in the *vita* of St Daniel the Stylite. He was sent by Emperor Leo to make sure that the saint was all right on top of his column at Anaplous in Constantinople after a storm hit the region. *PLRE* II, p. 7. See also St Daniel's *vita* in H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites* (Brussels, 1962), xlviii, p. 46. French translation in A.-J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient* (Paris, 1961), I, pp. 89-168.

⁷⁰ Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 310.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 371.

⁷² F. Marazzi, "Rome in Transition: Economic and Political Change in the Fourth and the Fifth Centuries", in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, ed. J. Smith (Leiden, 2000), p. 35. See also Dagron, "Le Christianisme dans la ville byzantine", pp. 8-10.

churches, *martyria*, monasteries as well as the charitable institutions, which required considerable sums of money. One should not forget that these churches, *martyria* and monasteries were built upon the private properties of their founders, which might simultaneously explain their relatively smaller size.

The translation of the relics of Apostle Andrew and St Luke in 357, the dedication of the basilica of St Sophia, the translation of the relics of St Chrysostomos in 438, a year before the return of empress Eudocia from the Holy Land, and following that, the translation of the relics of St Lawrence, should be set within this context of Christianisation. The founder of one of the oldest known hospitals, Saint Marcian was a wealthy aristocrat who lived during the reign of emperor Marcian (450-457).⁷³ One of the oldest *gerokomeia* (homes for the elderly) in Constantinople was built by *magistros* Anthemios, referred to above, who was sent to Rome in 467 as emperor of the west. Before he left for Rome, he transformed his house into a *gerokomeion*, just as Dexiocrates had done under Theodosios I and patrician Severos under Constans.⁷⁴

One should not fail to mention monasteries which gave the names of their founders to quarters in Constantinople. *Ta Dalmatou* was the quarter named after St Dalmatios, second hegoumenos of "presumably" the first monastery in Constantinople.⁷⁵ *Ta Diou*, named after one of the first monasteries in the city founded by St Dios, was situated along the Lykos valley.⁷⁶ The monastery of Euphemios in the fifth century, which was named after its founder Euphemios, eventually gave its name to the quarter, *ta Euphemiou*.⁷⁷ The quarter *ta Job* took its name from the monastery of Job,⁷⁸ *ta Kyrikou* from the monastery of Kyrikos whose location is not known,⁷⁹ *ta Manoueliou*, was the quarter where the monastery of Manouelios was situated.⁸⁰ Likewise, *ta Mara*,⁸¹ *ta Matronis*,⁸² *ta Stoudiou*,⁸³ *ta Theodotou*,⁸⁴ *ta Theodorou*,⁸⁵ *ta Maroniou*,⁸⁶ *ta Romanou*⁸⁷ were all quarters named after monasteries and their founders, most of whom were the city's aristocrats.

⁷³ Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy*, p. 156.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 223-231.

⁷⁵ For the quarter, see Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 333.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 343.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 350.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 384.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* It was close to the cistern of Aetios, thus at the summit of Petra valley.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 386. The monastery was close to the cistern of Aspar, not far from the cistern of Aetios, referred to above.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 431.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 432.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

In the process of Christianisation, especially considering the archaeological evidence, despite its scarcity, it is possible to argue that Constantinople was ahead of many western cities. In imitation and replication of the holy sites, Constantinopolitan examples by far predate examples from other cities. All surviving imitations of the *loca sancta* in the west date from the ninth century and after, whereas in Constantinople there are examples of the *imitatio* of the Holy Sepulchre that date from the late fourth century.⁸⁸ True, in Rome as in Constantinople the first monasteries were founded in the second half of the fourth century,⁸⁹ yet the latter was nominated to be the political and religious center of the east where all the first monks came from. Even in the sixth century Constantinople was ahead of Rome, still exporting its monks and saints to the banks of the Tiber. The first ecumenical council took place in Nicaea in 325 followed by the second council in Constantinople in 381. Gregory of Nyssa records that religion was the main topic at the streets in Constantinople, shortly before the council: "Ask for the correct change, and they lecture you on the Begotten and the Unbegotten; or for the price of bread, and they respond that the Father is greater than the Son inferior; or if the bath is warm enough, and they define the Son for you as being from nothing".⁹⁰

As is mentioned in the introduction, both secondary and primary sources on the activities of the early monks in the city are scarce. The first article on the subject by J. Pargoire appeared slightly more than a century ago, until the issue was taken up again by G. Dagron in the seventies. Relatively recently, Helen Saradi wrote on the early saints. Peter Hatlie is currently working on an extensive study on early monasteries in Constantinople, from the fourth to the late ninth century, covering roughly the same period as the present one.⁹¹

Concerning hagiographies Saradi points out that in the main they represent Constantinople as a battleground for the early saint. The saints come from the east; they do not belong to the city. They only enter when there is a non-orthodox enemy to combat:

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 462.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 478.

⁸⁸ R. Ousterhout, "Loca Sancta and the Architectural Response to Pilgrimage", in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout, p. 112.

⁸⁹ G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents of Rome from the Fifth through the Tenth Century* (Rome, 1957), introduction, p. xiv.

⁹⁰ Holum suggests that he was referring to the situation before the council. K. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Los Angeles, 1982), pp. 16-17.

⁹¹ J. Pargoire, "Les débuts du monachisme à Constantinople", *Revue des questions historiques* 65 (1899), 67-143. The article was unavailable to me. G. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville: Le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine (451)", *TM* 4 (1970), pp. 229-276; *idem.*, "Le christianisme dans la ville

otherwise, they remain outside the walls which open only "miraculously". Judging from the reluctance of the saints to enter the city and their repulsed attitude, she argues that this defined the relationship between the saints and Constantinople between the fourth and the sixth centuries. According to her, after the sixth century this premise lost its validity since by then the saints were no more outsiders and their presence within the walls came to be accepted as normal.⁹² The motif of repugnance towards the presence of a monk and a monastery inside the city can be found in every single *vita*. This possibly implies that even if the saint was at ease with it, his hagiographer certainly was not. The fact that the authors felt the need to justify the saint's *adventus* to the city signifies the norm which they were certainly aware of. As we have seen, the early saints of Egypt were solitary hermits who dwelled in caves. Many of the early monasteries were founded in the least accessible places. Hence, the hagiographers of the early Constantinopolitan monks attempted to find an excuse for their presence in the capital. This was because they were trying to justify the deviation from the norm (the tradition established by the monks on the desert) although their presence in Constantinople was not unnatural. The authors of the *vitae* must have done their homework and read the life of Antony, the writings of Palladios, and other early lives (if they lived in the late sixth century, it is highly likely that they were aware of the works of John Moschos, Cyril of Skythopolis) and, having read them, must have become aware of the discrepancy between the ideal saint away from the *oikoumene* and the one whose *vita* he wished to compose. To explain, erase or to reduce the effects of "extraordinariness", they cling to the idea of orthodoxy. The saints of Constantinople become defenders of the true faith, champions of orthodoxy, who enter the city when it is about to fall to heresy. Between the fourth and ninth centuries "orthodoxy" itself was an evasive term by which every religious faction defined itself. It is therefore interesting to see how and when Constantinopolitan monks became fully orthodox or were seen as such. As the quotation from Sozomen on St Isaac shows, almost only the orthodox monks (and saints) are recorded:

"Isaac, a monk of great virtue, who feared no danger in the cause of God, presented himself before him, and addressed him [Valens] in the following words: 'Give back, O emperor, to the orthodox, and to those who maintain the Nicene doctrines, the churches of which you have deprived them, and the victory will be yours.' The emperor was offended at this act of boldness and commanded that Isaac should be arrested and kept in chains...Isaac, however, replied 'You will not return unless you restore the churches'".⁹³

byzantine". pp. 3-25; H. Saradi, "Constantinople and its Saints: 4-6th Centuries. The Image of the City and Social Considerations", *Studi Medievali* 36 (1995), pp. 87-110. Hatlie's work has not yet been published.

⁹² Saradi, "Constantinople and its Saints" pp. 98, 102.

⁹³ Sozomen, 6. xl, p. 376. It is worthy of note that he had access to essentially the same *vita* of Isaac that has managed to come down to us.

For this reason, it is highly likely that many monks (including solitaries) came to Constantinople and founded monasteries in the early fifth century. It was rather the *establishment* of monasticism, particularly, as Dagron (and Pargoire) stated earlier, the establishment of "orthodox" monasticism in Constantinople, which took longer.⁹⁴ Sozomen received his education in monastic schools in Alexandria, which is why he is interested in monks, and devotes a great portion of his work to the origins of monasticism. When it comes to the monks in Constantinople he singles out St Isaac, "a monk of great virtue". He actually was in Constantinople around 406, hence must have read or heard more about other Constantinopolitan monks, and certainly must have seen more. Why, then, does he refer only to Isaac? Is it because he is writing (ecclesiastical) *history* and to be included in such a work one not only has to be orthodox but also "dead"?⁹⁵ It is therefore not surprising that Sokrates, a Constantinopolitan who was a contemporary of St Isaac, does not refer to him (because he was not yet canonised as orthodox) or to any monks or monasteries in Constantinople, although he too celebrates the memory of Antony and the desert monks.⁹⁶ This allows us to draw the conclusion that the *vitae* pertain only to the monks who were considered to be orthodox. We have access only to indirect references to other monks and monasteries; those viewed as heretical, and their presence in early Constantinople.

The plurality of sects and different beliefs was not in fact limited to Constantinople but was an empire-wide phenomenon, that the rulers tried to eliminate. The Law Code compiled under Theodosios II lists these "heresies" alongside the means to lead penitents back to orthodox Christianity. Early sources on Constantinople provide plenty of evidence for different sects and religious groups who founded their own churches (and monasteries) in the early fifth century. Sokrates refers to the different stages of the presence of the Arians, Novatians and Macedonians in Constantinople. It seems that the Arians and the Novatians were already in the city before Makedonios, archbishop of Constantinople, tried to eradicate them by entrenching his own followers. He seems to have tried to use one sect to uproot the other. For example, he propelled the Arians to demolish the church of Novatians near

⁹⁴ I think Dagron actually means "establishment" of orthodox monasticism in the city. See Dagron, "Les moines et la ville", p. 239.

⁹⁵ If Sozomen finished his writings in 447-448 as stated in the introduction (p. 201), then we know from the trial of Eutychios that there were at least 23 more monasteries in the city. Plus, judging from the repercussions of the trial it is unlikely (though not impossible) that Sozomen was unaware of what was going on at the capital at that time. Even if he wrote before the trial, the argument holds, since the signatures of the monks who were present at the trial prove that there were monasteries in the city before the trial. The signatures show that the "founders' generation" has already passed for some of the monasteries because in these cases the founders are referred to as "*makarios*", meaning that they were not alive at the time of trial. See *ACO II*, pp. 146-147.

⁹⁶ Sokrates, I, xxi, p. 25.

Pelargius. However, he was not successful at this particular attempt, since after the destruction of the church inside the city they built another one across the water at Sykai.⁹⁷ In any case, after the removal of Makedonios from power (381) they must have returned to the same church which they had in city for there is yet another reference to the Novatian church at Pelargius during the fire of 433.⁹⁸ We learn that after the council of 381 the Macedonians were deprived of both churches which they had at Constantinople "before the old walls of the imperial city" and of those they had "at Kyzikos and many others at the rural districts of the Hellespont".⁹⁹ Sozomen tells us that Makedonios appointed Marathonios as superintendent of the monasteries and convents. Most probably then, during the reigns of Constantius (whose Arian links were pronounced), Julian and Valens, until the accession of emperor Theodosios I, these non-orthodox groups had their own churches and monasteries in Constantinople provided for them by the court and their lay supporters.¹⁰⁰ Sozomen refers to a certain Eunomios in Constantinople, who was banished from the city by Theodosios I. However, before his eviction he must have been very active since "this heretic had fixed his residence in the suburbs of Constantinople and held frequent churches [i.e. gatherings, religious meetings] in private houses, where he read his own writings".¹⁰¹ Likewise, in another occasion Sozomen refers to the Arians in Constantinople, deprived of their churches in the city again under Theodosios.¹⁰² Robert Taft points to the importance of the Arians in fourth century Constantinople, arguing that compared to the Arians, Nicaenes were in fact a "small minority". What is even more interesting is his reference to Chrysostomos as the instigator of

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, xxxviii, p. 66. There is another reference to the expulsion of the Novatians from the city under Valens in Sozomen, xiv, pp. 384-385.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 6, xxxix, p. 175: "Paul bishop of the Novatians acquired the reputation of man truly beloved of God in a greater measure than before. For a terrible conflagration having broken out at Constantinople, such as had never happened before—for the fire destroyed the greater part of the city—as the largest public granaries, the Achillean bath, and everything else in the way of the fire were being consumed, it at length approached the church of the Novatians situated near Pelargius." Paul's prayers were heard and his church was spared from the fire.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 6, xxxi, p. 170.

¹⁰⁰ The link between Arianism and the court can be traced from the high sequence of Arian eunuchs at court. Under Constantius, some of these eunuchs were accorded church positions. Leontios, for instance, was appointed as Patriarch of Antioch. When he died, he was replaced by Eudoxios in whose election the eunuchs in Constantinople played an important role. One should note that, although orthodox historians blame the eunuchs, associating them with Arianism rather than the emperor, the reality was the opposite. The eunuchs were appointed by the emperor, and if they were Arians, it has to be interpreted that the emperor himself was in favor of Arianism, as Sidéris very plausibly argues. See G. Sidéris, *Eunuques et pouvoir à Byzance 4e-7e siècles*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Sorbonne University (Paris, 2001), pp. 346-347.

¹⁰¹ Sozomen, 7, xvii, p. 387.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 8, viii, p. 404: "The Arians, having been deprived of their churches in Constantinople during the reign of Theodosios, held their churches without the walls of the city".

the vigils and the processions with antiphonal *psalmodia*, an eastern tradition he brought from Antioch to compete with the Arian services.¹⁰³

Judging from these accounts, Constantinople seems to have been a battleground for different Christian groups, each trying to impose its "correct" version of Christianity. It was, however, the preferences and the pronounced faith of the emperors, the aristocrats and the archbishops (patriarchs after the Council of Chalcedon) that determined the nature of the Christian topography in Constantinople. Historians, chroniclers and hagiographers wrote for and about the triumphant party, and kept silent about the "rest" for the reason expressed in the *vita* of St Thekla: "ὡν καὶ τὸ μνησθῆναι μόνον μιάσματός ἐστι πληρωθῆναι".¹⁰⁴ Mainly for this reason, therefore, modern historians are compelled to make assumptions to surmise what the actual situation in the city might have been.¹⁰⁵

At this point it is also important to note the involvement of monks in charitable activities in early Constantinople. From the second half of the fourth century onwards, there is a remarkable increase in the number of references to the charitable activities of monasteries; evidence may be derived from the *vitae*, primarily those of St Artemios and St Sampson.¹⁰⁶ The earliest *xenoi* (hospitals) of Sampson, Euboulos and Marcian at Perama¹⁰⁷ as well as the *gerokomeia* (houses for the elderly), orphanages and *diakonia* (baths) of the capital date from this period.¹⁰⁸ Christian charity, directed particularly at the needy and the destitute of society, gradually replaced its counterpart from Antiquity, which was directed primarily for "the smooth functioning of the state".¹⁰⁹ One should underline the role played by the *spoudaioi*

¹⁰³ R. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West. The Origins of the Divine Service and its Meaning for Today* (Collegeville, Minn., 1986), p. 171.

¹⁰⁴ Dagron, *Vie et miracles de Sainte Thècle*, p. 258.

¹⁰⁵ Considering early Constantinopolitan monks, Dagron argues for their semi-Arian link. See "Les moines et la ville", p. 246. Likewise, Janin thinks that the date 382 refers to the foundation of the earliest orthodox monastery in Constantinople: he seems to be sure that "il y en eut auparavant d'hérétiques." *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. Première partie; le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Les églises et les monastères*, vol. III (Paris, 1969), introduction, p. xiii.

¹⁰⁶ Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, pp. 122-126.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 64, 79-88, 91-95; T. S. Miller, "The Sampson Hospital of Constantinople", *ByzF* 15 (1990), pp. 121-135.

¹⁰⁸ T. S. Miller, "The Orphanotropheion of Constantinople", in *Through the Eye of a Needle*, eds. Hanawalt and Lindberg, pp. 83-104. The first Orphanage founded by Zotikos before 472 was, according to Miller, possibly part of the charitable program intensified during the patriarchates of Makedonios and Marathionios. St. Paul, another orphanage founded in the fourth century, was renovated and supported by the donations of Justin II.

¹⁰⁹ The difference may be exemplified by the distinction between *panis aedium* and the various charitable *oikoi* of a Christian society. As we have seen, in Constantinople only those who owned houses were accorded the right to free food rations. For the difference between antique and Christian practices, see E. Patlagean, *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance 4e- 7e siècles* (Mouton, Paris, La Haye, 1977), pp. 182-196. In the Near Eastern societies of Antiquity, "charity" was largely for the maximization of the ruler's authority and not for its intrinsic value. On this see P. Hanson, "The Ancient Near Eastern Roots of Social Welfare", in *Through the Eye of a Needle*, eds. Hanawalt and Lindberg, pp. 7-28. A. Kazhdan, "Byzantium and Social Welfare", pp. 67-82 in the same volume, argues that in Byzantium the role of the church in charitable activities increased after

and the *philoponoi* in the organisation of charities.¹¹⁰ Particularly worthy of note is the relationship between these urban, lay confraternities and the churches and monasteries which they sometimes used as outlets of charitable activities financed from their own private wealth.¹¹¹

Before passing on to the *vitae* of the early Constantinopolitan orthodox saints, I believe it is important to make a short summary of what they indicate about the state of the early monasteries in the city. First, a good percentage of the early monks in the city were from the east. Constantiople thus served as the convergence point for the religious from the east and wealthy Constantinopolitans. This is key to understanding the nature of early foundations; as we shall see in the examples below, early monasteries were founded upon lands, or literally in the *oikoi*, houses, provided by the wealthy for the benefit of their favourite saints. Most of the early foundations were of short duration and disappeared when their founders died or for some reason fell from favour. This is another reason why information on early monks and monasteries is very scarce; they were not yet institutionalised and hence had a precarious existence in the city where so much depended upon the charm and skills of the monk/ascetic or the hegoumenos. It has already been mentioned that we know only about the orthodox monks because only their *vitae* were written and allowed to survive.¹¹²

Let us start with St Daniel the Stylite, originally from Mesopotamia, a monk from the monastery of St Symeon the Stylite which he left with the intention of going to the Holy Land.¹¹³ However, he was dissuaded from doing so by an old man who told him to go toward Constantinople instead, "the second Jerusalem": ὄντως σοι, ὄντως σοι, ὄντως σοι, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἰδοὺ τρίτον σε ὥρκισα. μὴ ἀπελθῇς ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα, ἀλλ' ἀπελθε εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον

the seventh century and that both the poor and the rich benefited from it. For the *diakonia* in particular, see P. Magdalino, "Church, Bath and *Diakonia* in Medieval Constantinople", in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. R. Morris (Birmingham, 1990), pp. 165-188.

¹¹⁰ Both were urban, lay Christian confraternities which were engaged in charitable activities. For the *spoudaioi* in Constantinople, see Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, pp. 124-128, 134-135, 244-245. For the *philoponoi*, see Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization*, vol II, pp. 1-51.

¹¹¹ See Dagron, "L'église et la chrétienté byzantines", in *Histoire du Christianisme*, vol. 4, p. 37.

¹¹² *Vita* of St Isaac edited in AASS Mai, VII, pp. 244-253. The full text of the *vita* of St Dios is in the Athonite library of Dionysios. This has not yet been published; however, Dr. Dirk Krausmüller from Belfast University is currently working on it. In the absence of the full version of the *vita*, the only source for Dios remains the *Synaxarion* of Constantinople: *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. Delehay, *Propylaeum ad AASS Nov.* (Brussels, 1902), cols. 829-830. His *synaxis* was on July 19; *V. Dalmat.*; *V. Alexander*; *V. Markell.*; *V. Daniel*. French translation in Festugière, *Les moines d'orient*, pp. 89-168, partial English translation in *Three Byzantine Saints*. For St Hypatios, see *V. Hypatios*. French translation in Festugière, *Les moines d'orient*, pp. 13-89. Although he was not a monk, St Zotikos was one of the early saints in Constantinople; therefore, his life is instructive for our purposes as well. T. S. Miller, "The Legend of Saint Zotikos According to Constantine Acropolites", *AB* 112 (1994), pp. 339-376; *idem.*, "The Orphanotropheion of Constantinople", pp. 83-104.

¹¹³ *V. Daniel*, pp. 1-10.

καὶ βλέπεις δευτέραν Ἱερουσαλήμ, τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν."¹¹⁴ At Constantinople his inability to speak Greek did not prevent Daniel from establishing himself at the *martyrion* in the vicinity of Sosthenion. He finally arrived at Anaplous, further in the direction of the city along the same coast, and settled near the church of St Michael. Convinced by his saintliness, archbishop Anatolios proposed to build for him a monastery, in one of the *proasteia*, outside the city walls: "Come and see them and choose whichever suits your liking and we shall provide you with it".¹¹⁵ His relationship with the eunuchs of the court as well as the aristocrats in the city is worthy of note. Markos, *silentarius*, also from Syria and Daniel's friend, asked the saint's permission to build him a column. Immediately after the episode with Markos we are presented with another *cubicularius*, yet again from Mesopotamia-Syria: Gelanios, eunuch at the "imperial table", who built the saint a new column much taller than the first one. These references to the relationship between the palace eunuchs and saints suit the image of the post-Theodosian orthodox eunuchs well.¹¹⁶

St Daniel's *vita* is important in showing that not all monks in the city belonged to a monastery. Although he is rather an eccentric example, his case suggests, like St Zotikos, that there also were solitary monks, especially in the suburbs of the city. It is most important to note that almost all of his acquaintances are wealthy people. This is depicted in the miracle concerning the healing of the son of Sergios, a lawyer from Thracian origins,¹¹⁷ as well as in the next miracle in which Alexander, the son of Kyrios, *apo hypaton* and *apo eparchon*, is exorcised and relieved from the possession of an evil spirit.¹¹⁸ This is not the end of the list of the aristocrats: Empress Eudokia herself visits the saint when she returns from "Africa", having heard about the saint from yet another member of the upper class in Constantinople, from Olybrius (Anicius Olybrius), father of Anicia Juliana and emperor of the west.¹¹⁹ Emperor Leo also personally visits the saint. Having seen that the swelling in his feet was cured through the saint's prayers, Leo ordered that another column be built at the site.¹²⁰ Hence, St Daniel the Stylite lived on columns built by two *cubicularii* and an emperor. Daniel also played an important role during the dispute between emperor Zeno (474-475) and archbishop Akakios. In another occasion, *patrikios* Dagaleiphos, son of Areobindos, asks for

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹¹⁵ "παρ' ὃ οὐκ ἰσχύω πείθειν ὑμᾶς συνδιαγείν ἡμῖν, κέλευσον, οἷκ' οδομήσω σοι μοναστήριον σεμνόν. καὶ προάστεια δὲ ἔχει πολλὰ ἢ ἀγιωτάτη ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία καὶ ἐπιτήδεια. Ἐξελθὼν βλέπε αὐτὰ καὶ οἷον ἀρέσει σοι παρέχομεν." *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26. Also see Sidéris, *Eunuques et pouvoir à Byzance*, pp. 370-371.

¹¹⁷ *I. Daniel*, p. 30.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹¹⁹ For Olybrius, see *PLRE II*, pp. 796-798.

¹²⁰ *I. Daniel*, pp. 33-41.

the saint's support against the usurper Basiliskos (475-76).¹²¹ It is not surprising that another aristocrat, Eirais, a *patrikia*, installed a spiral ladder around the column and built his *martyrion* near the column.¹²²

There is one typical episode in the *vita* which refers to the foundation of a monastery in early Constantinople. In this episode Kalopodios, yet another *cubicularius*, first builds a church dedicated to the Archangel Michael, and then asks the saint to send him monks, announcing his intention to turn the establishment into a monastic complex with the church of St Michael at its center. St Daniel not only agrees to send him monks but also sends a young psalmist with a beautiful voice who had been mute before he was miraculously healed by the saint.¹²³

The introduction of the *vita* of St Isaac is a prelude to Constantine and his Christian virtues, praising him for having uprooted heresy from the earth's face together with 318 fathers, gathered at his instigation, at the Council of Nicaea.¹²⁴ Like St Daniel, St Isaac came from the "east", more precisely from the "desert of the east".¹²⁵ He too was led by the divine voices urging him to go to Constantinople: his bowels were "inflamed" by the irresistible desire to go there. He arrived at the city during the reign of emperor Valens (364-378), when Thrace and the Danube were under barbarian attack. Isaac was the first monk in Constantinople as we are informed, "οὐ γὰρ ἦν τότε ἐνταῦθα ἵχνος μοναχοῦ." He is portrayed as the symbol of Orthodoxy, constantly harassing the emperor and urging him to open the churches back to worship.¹²⁶ On one occasion, he was tortured and thrown into prison by the emperor's men Saturnios and Victor.¹²⁷ Saturnios was *magister militum* of the East during 382-383. He owned a house in the city, from which the gate at the Constantinian wall received its name.¹²⁸ Victor, originally a Samaritan, was *magister equitum* of the East, serving under emperors Constantius and Valens. He was in Constantinople in 380 during the reign of Theodosios, before his visit to Antioch. Like Saturnios, he too owned houses in

¹²¹ For all these episodes, see *ibid.*, pp. 69-76.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

¹²⁴ *I. Isaac*, pp. 244-245.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

"Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ οὖν ἐκείνῳ ἦν τις ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς, ἀγγελικὸν βίον ἐπὶ γῆς μετερερχόμενος, τοῦνομα Ἰσαάκιος, τοῦ Ὑιοῦ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐπώνυμος. ὃς κατὰ τὸ εἶωθός εἰας οὐρανόθεν ἀκούει φωνῆς, παρακελευομένης κατιέναι τῆς ἐρήμου, καὶ ἐλθεῖν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει."

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* This incident is referred to by both Sozomen, 6. xl, p. 376 and Theodoret, *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues and Letters*, trans. B. Jackson, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol III (Edinburgh, 1996), 4. xxxi, p. 130.

¹²⁷ *I. Isaac*, p. 247.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* For Saturnios, see *PLRE I*, pp. 807-808. For his house, see Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 423.

Constantinople.¹²⁹ At first all the negatives are put on one side: the orthodox churches in the city remain closed while the barbarians invade the lands ruled by an Arian emperor who is surrounded by ruthless officials. This is contrasted with Isaac and what he stands for, i.e. orthodoxy and orthodox monasticism in Constantinople. After the death of Valens and the enthronement of Theodosios I (379-395), however, things change: evil vanishes slowly but surely. Theodosios defeats the barbarians, and before he returns to Constantinople he goes to Thessaloniki (a city which had not fallen to Arianism), where he takes baptism and celebrates mass before returning to the capital. Thus, the new emperor enters Constantinople as an orthodox ruler, the proof of which comes with his order compelling the Arians to leave the city.¹³⁰ At the same time Isaac's former tormentors Saturnios and Victor turn into faithful benefactors competing with one another to make him the better offer. Saturnios gives him a *proasteion*, "not far from the walls"; Victor builds a new cell in Psamatheia.¹³¹ Eventually, Isaac stays at the duplex-cell which Saturnios built despite the saint's insistence on a modest one.¹³²

There is no word in the *vita* on the dispute between Chrysostomos and Isaac. We know however that Saturnios, Isaac, his fellow monks, and certain members of the senatorial class in Constantinople formed a strong faction against the archbishop for his puritanical measures in religious issues and for transferring senatorial wealth to the Church, using rich women of the same class.¹³³ The most famous of these rich women was Olympias, a member of the Roman senatorial aristocracy. Her wealth comprised properties in Thrace, Galatia, Cappadocia and Bithynia, and houses in Constantinople, measured in many *litrai* of gold and silver.¹³⁴ Her monastery and wealth were to a great extent under Chrysostomos' control. It is made explicit in the *vita* that everything she owned belonged to the Great Church, including her right to the *panis aedium/politikos artos*, the free bread allocation, "through the saintly

¹²⁹For Victor, see *PLRE* I, pp. 957-958.

¹³⁰I. Isaac, pp. 248-249.

¹³¹...ὁ Οὐίκτωρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκέκτητο ἐν τῷ παραθαλασσίῳ μέρει τῆς πόλεως πλησίον Ἐλενιανῶν, εἰς τὸν καλούμενον ψαμαθείαν, καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀμφότεροι κτίζειν ἐπ' ὀνόματι τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰσαακίου" p. 251

¹³²*Ibid.*, p. 252. Concerning the dispute between Isaac, the monks and Chrysostomos, the discrepancy between the desert monks and the Constantinopolitan monks appears to have been the central concern. Chrysostomos was urging the monks to "live up to the standards" of the early fathers. As Liebeschuetz makes clear, Chrysostomos had in mind the "nostalgic" monasteries he was acquainted with in Syria. J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, "Friends and Enemies of John Chrysostom," in *Maistor. Classical, Byzantine, Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, ed. A. Moffat (Canberra, 1984), pp. 91-93. The dispute between the saint and the patriarch is mentioned in Sozomen. See also Dagron, "Les moines et la ville", pp. 262-263; T. Gregory, *Vox Populi. Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, 1979), p. 53. The *vita*, however, makes no reference to the event. On the other hand, Palladios obviously knew Isaac since he refers to him as "the leader of the false monks." See Liebeschuetz, "Friends and Enemies", p. 92. Besides, the *vita* of Dalmatios informs us that Isaac was yet alive during the patriarchate of Attikos (March 406- 10 October 425).

¹³³On this, see the illuminating article by Liebeschuetz, "Friends and Enemies", pp. 85-111.

patriarch."¹³⁵ Even the location of the monastery is defined in relation to the patriarchate, being "not far from the patriarchate, yet outside the walls".¹³⁶ Chrysostomos was expelled from the city and exiled following the council in 404. Hence, at that time the faction Isaac belonged to was victorious against the archbishop. Isaac was first buried in the monastery opposite the *martyrion* of St Stephen the Protomartyr, which Theodosios II had built. Later his remnants were transferred to the *martyrion* at Theodosios' orders and installed on the right hand side of the altar inside the building.¹³⁷ The relics of St John Chrysostomos, however, returned to Constantinople later on in 438, while St Isaac was already safely buried within the city.

Dalmatios was still *scholarios* in the capital when he first heard about St Isaac. The incident, we are told, was the first encounter between the "first" Constantinopolitan monk and his future successor.¹³⁸ Unlike Isaac, Dalmatios had good relations with the patriarchate, a fact confirmed by a dream he saw and Isaac interpreted.¹³⁹ However, both saints were orthodox. In fact, Dalmatios' *vita* reads almost like a chapter from the acts of the councils, based, as it is, almost exclusively on the letters exchanged between Dalmatios and the orthodox bishops of the Council of Ephesus, among them primarily Cyril of Alexandria. This is not surprising when one considers that the saint was very active during the council. In fact, it was one of these letters, sent to him from the council, that compelled him to leave the monastery he had not left for forty-eight years.

The actual order to leave the monastery, urging him to oppose Nestorios, came from the heavens. When Theodosios learned that Dalmatios had in fact left his monastery, was marching the streets of Constantinople and was waiting outside the doors of the palace, he could not refrain from expressing his astonishment: "many times during the earthquake I went to his cell, and asked to him to come out, however he was not persuaded".¹⁴⁰ Dalmatios in return assures him that it was for the sake of orthodoxy that he has left his cell.¹⁴¹

¹³⁴ *I. Olymp.* p. 413.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 411-412.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 415. The text possibly refers to Chrysostomos' house in Constantinople as "the patriarchate".

¹³⁷ *I. Isaac.* p. 253. The fact that he was buried to the right-hand side of the main altar and that it is specified in the *vita* might signify that he was given the place of honour.

¹³⁸ *I. Dalmat.*, p. 514.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 515.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 518. This is derived from *ACO* I, 1, 2. pp. 65- 66:

"ἦν δὲ ὁ ἅγιος Δαλμάτιος εἰς τῶν ἀρχιμανδριτῶν, ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔχων μὴ ἐξελθὼν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μοναστηρίου, ἀλλ' ἔσω ὡν ἀποκεκλεισμένος ὁ δὲ εὐσεβέστατος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς ἀπήρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔβλεπεν αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ σεισμῶν πολλάκις γενομένων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει καὶ πολλάκις παρακαλέσαντος τοῦ βασιλέως ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐξελθεῖν καὶ λιτανεῦσαι, μηδέποτε πεισθῆναι ἐξελθεῖν. εὐχαμένον δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ τούτου, φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ αὐτῷ κατήλθεν ὥστε ἐξελθεῖν. Θεὸς γὰρ οὐκ

One of the letters preserved in the *vita*, which Dalmatios sent to the synod at Ephesus as a defender of orthodoxy, is worthy of note. In this letter Dalmatios addresses Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, a certain Memnos, and the rest of the Holy Synod as the leader of the monks and on behalf of the Constantinopolitan clergy. This is not a viable act on his part, because it is not lawful for a monk to represent all the clergy even if the patriarch was seen as a full-blown heretic, as Nestorios was seen at the time.¹⁴² Dalmatios died after the condemnation of Nestorios at Ephesus. He was buried first at the Great Church,¹⁴³ but his relics were later taken to his monastery during the archbishopric of Proklos (434-446), who was present at the ceremony of the translation of his relics, carrying the coffin on his shoulders.¹⁴⁴ The fact that the monastery carries his name, not Isaac's, may point to the more respected position tradition attributes to Dalmatios.

The monastery of Dios was one of the first monasteries in Constantinople. It is referred to as the first monastery in an epigram of Theodore Stoudites. However, this contradicts the information in the *vita* of St Isaac, which makes explicit that there was not a single trace of a monastery before Isaac's arrival in the city, a claim which is repeated in the *vita* of St Hypatios.¹⁴⁵ Isaac, therefore, must have preceded Dios. The *Synaxarion* entry of July 19 informs us that St Dios, originally from Antioch, came to Constantinople during the reign of Theodosios II. Astonished at how saintly Dios was, the emperor gave money with which he founded a monastery.¹⁴⁶ Archbishop Attikos of Constantinople tonsured him as its presbyter. He was also known and respected by Patriarch Alexander of Antioch. The two

ἠθέλησεν ἀπολέσθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀγέλην εἰς τέλος. ἦν δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ λαὸς πολὺς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. ὡς οὖν ἦλθον εἰς τὸ παλάτιον, κληθέντες παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰσῆλθον οἱ ἀρχιμανδρίται καὶ ἔμεινε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μοναζόντων καὶ τῶν λαῶν, ψάλλοντες ἀντίφωνα. εἶτα ἐξῆλθον τυχόντες δικαίας ἀποκρίσεως. βώσι πάντες τὰ μανδᾶτα τοῦ βασιλέως. εἶτα ἀπολογοῦνται ὅτι ἀπέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Μωκίου, καὶ ἀναγινώσκομεν καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ μανθάνετε τὴν ἀπολογίαν τοῦ βασιλέως." See also Nestorios, *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford, 1925), p. 273. The *vita*, then, is safely dated approximately *after* (which should be interpreted very broadly) the second half of the fifth century. Nestorios was condemned in 431, and again in 451 in Chalcedon and thereafter. In any case it is obvious that Dalmatios' *vita* relies heavily on the acts of Ephesus.

¹⁴¹ "...καὶ ἐν οὐδενὶ παρείδον ἢ παραβλέπω, ἢ ἡμέλησα, μάλιστα ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ἔστι τὸ πρᾶγμα..." *I. Dalmat.*, p. 523. This, too, is from the acts.

¹⁴² He terms himself "Δαλμάτιος πατὴρ μοναχῶν ὑπὲρ παντός τοῦ κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν κλήρου." p. 521. However, in the letters preserved in the first volume of the acts, Dalmatios refers to himself as "Δαλμάτιος ὁ ἁγιοτάτος ἀρχιμάνδριτος", and he is referred to as "Δαλμάτιος πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης πατὴρ μοναστηρίων". See *ACO* I, 7, p. x and I, 3, p. 15 respectively.

¹⁴³ I do not see how it was possible for a fifth-century monk to be buried at a cemetery reserved for the patriarchs of Constantinople.

¹⁴⁴ *I. Dalmat.*, p. 524.

¹⁴⁵ "Ἀλλ' οὔτε ἐν τῇ φαιδρᾷ Κωνσταντίνου πόλει ὑπῆρχον τότε μοναστήρια, εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰσαακίου, ὃν διεδέξατο ὁ ἅγιος Δαλμάτιος." *I. Hypatios*, 6, p. 74

¹⁴⁶ *I. Dios*, col. 830.

miracles referred to in the entry concern the role St Dios played in the provisioning of the monastery where he was buried.

A relationship between hegoumenos and his apprentice similar to that which existed between Isaac and Dalmatios can be seen in the *vitae* of Alexander and Markellos, founder and third hegoumenos, respectively, of the Akoimetos monastery. Like Dalmatios, in Alexander we once again encounter an aristocratic gentleman, who gave up all his wealth and went to the Holy Land desiring to live in the manner of desert hermits. Originating from the islands of the archipelago, he was educated at Constantinople and was *eparchikos* in the troops of one of the prefects, either the pretorian pretoriat or the city prefecture, until he decided to distribute all his goods to the poor and left for the east to become a monk in the Syrian monastery of Elias.

After four years of penance he went to the desert, converted many people, including Raboulas, who, having embraced Christianity after encountering St Alexander, became bishop of Edessa.¹⁴⁷ Alexander was quite popular in Syria, where he was involved in political and religious disputes. For instance, he and his followers went to Antioch around 404 to prevent the famine and to organise opposition to the *patrikios* Porphyrios, an adversary of Chrysostomos. Despite his popularity, however, he was expelled from Antioch by Malchos, possibly another rival of Chrysostomos.¹⁴⁸

Alexander finally returned to Constantinople with twenty-four other monks, settling near the church of St Menas. The number soon reached thirty, a "multi-national" community composed of "Romans, Greeks and Syrians".¹⁴⁹ After expulsion from St Menas and from the church of the Apostles Peter and Paul, he eventually settled at Gomon on the Asian side of the Bosphoros close to the Black Sea. His *vita* makes no reference to Chrysostomos and the dispute between him and the leading aristocrats of the city. It is highly likely that the opposing party blamed Alexander for heresy, i.e. for having supported Chrysostomos in Antioch and Constantinople. Having received his monastic training in Syria, Alexander was more akin to the ideal monk Chrysostomos had in mind. Hence, it would not be surprising if the two men had supported one another. The Akoimetoι were reputed for singing psalms continuously. It is possible that they led the crowd during the nocturnal processions introduced by Chrysostomos. Moreover, Alexander's relationship with the monks of the city is also passed

¹⁴⁷ *I. Alexander*, pp. 664-673.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 688-689. Unsurprisingly, the *vita* does not refer at all to the dispute revolving around John Chrysostomos. The editor of the *vita*, De Stoop, derives the information from other sources. See introduction p. 649. One should note also that if he was in Constantinople one or two years after the council of the Oaks (early 404), then he must have clashed with the monks of the city, led by St Isaac, another adversary of Chrysostomos.

over in silence, and, if it were not for the *vita* of Hypatios, we would not know that he actually stayed at that monastery when he was attacked by the soldiers of emperor Theodosios II.

Unlike the *vita* of Isaac, which has many references to the support wealthy Constantinopolitans rendered to him, the *vita* of Alexander is largely based upon the rivalry between the *archontes*, the powerful rulers, and the saint. It seems that Isaac, Emperor Theodosios II and his entourage formed the rival group against the Akoimetoι and John Chrysostomos, who were supported by Augusta Pulcheria.¹⁵⁰ The *vita*, therefore, possibly dates from after the middle of the fifth century at the earliest, when the court was reconciled with the faction represented by Chrysostomos.

St Markellos, originally from Ephesus, was the third hegoumenos of the monastery of the Akoimetoι. He joined Alexander's monastery at around 425, when they were established near the church of St Menas. Following Alexander's death in ca. 430, John became the hegoumenos of the monastery which had then moved from Gomon and established finally at Irenaion across from Sosthenion along the Asian coast of the Bosphoros. When Markellos was made hegoumenos after John, the number of the monks, which included such important figures of the time as Bishop Julian of Ephesus and Peter the Fuller of Antioch, increased.¹⁵¹ Monks "rushed" to the monastery of the Akoimetoι from Bithynia, Pontos, Illyria, Persia as well as Armenia. But above all, Markellos is best known for backing Germanos against his rival for the patriarchate of Constantinople, Patrikios, brother of Aspar, one of the wealthiest court officials in the city. As we shall see, the hegoumenoi of the Akoimetoι signed the petitions to the Emperor and the Patriarch in 518 and 536, signifying that by then they were numbered among the established orthodox monasteries of the capital.

The *vita* of Markellos gives ample information on the internal relations within a monastery like the rivalry between the candidates for leadership after the death of the hegoumenos. In the *vita*, such a rivalry follows the death of Alexander. John, the eldest monk in the monastery, was elected as his successor. During John's hegoumenate the monastery moved to Irenaion, in search of a quieter place away from the hustle and bustle of the city, yet close enough to its benefits, strategically located midway between the city and the straits, where the Bosphoros unites with the Black Sea:

"Οὗτος ὁ Ἰωάννης παρακαλεῖται ἀφεῖναι μὲν τὸ στόμα τοῦ Πόντου, ἐλθεῖν δὲ ἐν ᾧ μέχρι καὶ νῦν τὸ μοναστήριον ἵδρυται τόπω, καὶ τῆς πολλῆς ὀχλήσεως

¹⁴⁹ *I. Alexander*, p. 692.

¹⁵⁰ *I. Hypatios*, pp. 242-246.

¹⁵¹ This according to John Kalybites. See introduction *I. Markell.*, p. 275.

ἀπῆλλαγμένω καὶ τὴν πολλὴν ἐρημίαν ἐκπεφευγότι, κειμένω δὲ ἐν μέσῳ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πόντου εἰσβολῆς καὶ τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης."¹⁵² The rivalry between John and Markellos intensified after his appointment as John's successor. Following the election, Markellos officially became the leader of the monastery.¹⁵³ During his hegoumenate the monastery engaged in charity and caring for the poor. The monks provided free bread to the poor and the passers-by, supplied from the mill, sustained by a very old and lazy donkey that required extra care.¹⁵⁴ In a short time the monastery became quite wealthy with an "uncountable" amount of ready cash while it kept growing in size. The courtyard extended, so that Markellos, not knowing what measures to take, seriously considered moving to another place. At this point Pharetrios, son of a senator, entered the monastery together with his sons,¹⁵⁵ and all his wealth became part of the monastery's fortune. With this money, Markellos built rooms/cells for the brothers and a hostel, thus rendering it a monastic complex with all the architectural elements including those required for charity. His monastery was without doubt a *koinobion*, centred on a courtyard where possibly the chapel (which is not mentioned) and the monks' cells were located. It had its own mill for bread supply. The hostel provided for the poor and the needy. With his *vita*, then, Markellos provides us with a reliable review of the architectural elements of an urban monastery near Constantinople.

The relationship between the monastery and the city was reciprocal: just as the monastery was rewarded by its location close to the political and economic centre, so did the city benefit from the presence of the saint. We learn for example, that during the famine of 466 the whole city was miraculously delivered from famine by the bread provided from the *sitotheke* of the monastery.¹⁵⁶ Markellos also predicted at which quarter of the city the fire of 465 would stop.¹⁵⁷

Being close to the city at the same time had its disadvantages. Once again the Akoimetoι were set against powerful senators. On this particular occasion Aspar and his son Ardabourios constituted the challenge. Aspar held the most important military positions under emperors Theodosios II, Marcian and Leo I. He was rewarded with the title *patrikios* in 451, following Marcian's ascension to the throne. At the end of Marcian's rule Aspar was powerful

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 292.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 294-295.

¹⁵⁵ If only Pharetrios had entered the monastery, only part of his wealth (the remaining part after it was distributed among his children) would have been left to the monastery.

¹⁵⁶ I. Markell., pp. 308-309. For the relationship between monasteries around Constantinople and the city see M. Kaplan, "L'hinterland religieux de Constantinople: Moines et saints de banlieue d'après l'hagiographie", in *Constantinople and Its Hinterland*, eds. G. Dagron and C. Mango (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 191-205.

¹⁵⁷ I. Markell., p. 316.

enough to nominate his own candidate Leo, during whose reign he served as *magister utriusque militiae*. A large cistern in the northwestern part of the city was named after him. He was also known for leading the panic-stricken populace of Constantinople during the great fire of 465. Aspar became an adversary of the saint when his son was nominated patriarch by the ruling emperor Leo.¹⁵⁸ To prevent this from happening, Markellos created havoc at the hippodrome.¹⁵⁹ Eventually, Ardabur and Aspar were executed in 471 on allegations of conspiracy against the crown. Markellos' dream, by which he predicted the fall of the family, refers to this event after which he could easily help install his candidate Gennadios.

Another *vita* containing valuable information on monasteries in early Constantinople is that of St Hypatios, written by Kallinikos, possibly of Syrian origin, who claims to be a disciple of the saint at the Rouphinianai monastery, close to Chalcedon, located near the place known as the Oaks, where the council that condemned Chrysostomos took place in 404.¹⁶⁰ Hypatios founded his monastery close to the house, or rather the palace of Flavianus Rufinus, Praetorian Prefect of the East between 392-395, who had built a monastery and, as part of the same monastic complex, a church dedicated to the apostles Peter and Paul, where also his own tomb was placed.¹⁶¹ The fate of the monastery, however, is worthy of attention.

Hypatios, son of a *scholastikos*, originated from Phrygia. He started monastic life at the monastery of Ionas in Thrace, founded by an ex-soldier. Because of the Hun invasions the monks had to evacuate the monastery. Therefore, together with his brothers Timotheos and Moschios, Hypatios proceeded towards the east in search of another place where they could continue practicing *askesis*. The criterion for the ideal site is interesting. Hypatios tells his brothers that he wants to continue in the fashion in which they formerly lived and wants to stay away from the city: "Ἐγὼ συνήθισα εἰς ὄρος οἰκεῖν, οὐ γὰρ εἰς πόλιν", which gets the consent of his brothers.¹⁶² However, they eventually settle in the vicinity of a church dedicated to the Apostles, near the palace of Rufinus. The *vita* tells that nearby there was a monastery which was previously occupied by Egyptian monks. When Rufinus died, the monks returned back to Egypt, leaving the monastery desolate. Hence, rather than settling in a

¹⁵⁸ See *PLRE* II, pp. 164-169 for Aspar, *PLRE* II, pp. 135-136 for Ardaburios and *PLRE* II, pp. 842-843 for his brother Patrikios.

¹⁵⁹ *I. Markell.*, pp. 314-316, for the dispute between the family and St Markellos. Patrikios' candidacy for the patriarchate is possibly false. However, the fact that he was married to the daughter of the emperor and would succeed him troubled the orthodox in the city, since the family was known for its professed Arianism.

¹⁶⁰ See *V. Hypatios*, introduction, pp. 9-18.

¹⁶¹ *PLRE* I, pp. 778-781.

¹⁶² *V. Hypatios*, p. 98

cave, Hypatios and his brothers decided to stay at this forlorn palace formerly occupied by Egyptian monks.¹⁶³

The monastery had the same architectural elements described for the Akoimetoï in the *vita* of Markellos. It had a central courtyard surrounded by cells together with a church as part of the complex. And again in the same manner, Hypatios' monks benefited from being close to the city, where the monks occasionally went to sell what they had grown in the garden.¹⁶⁴ In addition, the monastery also has its own cistern and a storage room (*kellari*) for wheat.¹⁶⁵

Apart from St Isaac who visited Hypatios, advising him to accept monks from all lands,¹⁶⁶ he also received visitors from among the wealthy Constantinopolitans, among them Urbicius, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, head of the palace eunuchs who became the benefactor of the monastery, financing the construction of an oratory, to which emperor Theodosios II also contributed.¹⁶⁷ Theodosios personally visited the monastery together with his daughters.¹⁶⁸

From the *vitae* we have so far seen the relationship between the early monks/saints, heretics and the wealthy aristocrats of the city. The monks either came from the east or were trained there. At Constantinople they established monasteries supported by the emerging Christian upper class of the city. Overall, the reign of emperor Theodosios II is distinguished as an important point in the history of the early monasteries. Almost all the monks we have seen have lived through or in his reign and were associated with the officials in his court. In the *vitae* of St Melania and Peter the Iberian, the palace during the reign of Theodosios is compared to a monastery, with the palace eunuchs especially inclined toward ascetic life.¹⁶⁹

A short glance at the important events after the council of Nicaea (325), the same year when Constantine prohibited gladiatorial games in Antioch,¹⁷⁰ will draw a useful outline of the growth of Christianisation all around the Roman Empire. While Christians were being persecuted within the borders of the Persian Empire, in 338 there was a council in Egypt. During 340-341, there were two other regional councils, one in Antioch, the other in Rome, at which Athanasios, archbishop of Alexandria was vindicated. The next year, a law was issued forbidding pagan sacrifices. Between 347 and 380, regional councils were held almost

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 98-100.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

¹⁶⁷ For Urbicius, see *PLRE II*, pp. 1188-1190.

¹⁶⁸ *I. Hypatios*, pp. 226-228.

¹⁶⁹ Sid ris, *Eunuques et pouvoir   Byzance*, p. 384.

¹⁷⁰ J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch. City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972), p. 142.

annually throughout the empire, starting with the council of Sirmium in 347, and followed by councils in Carthage, Sirmium, Arles, Milan, Ankyra, Arminium/Seleukeia, Constantinople, Paris, Alexandria, Lampsakos, Rome, Antioch and Laodikeia. The Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople followed in 381.¹⁷¹ The monks played an important role in some of these councils. For example, in 387, the people of Antioch, newly recovered from the famine of 362-363 yet still without regular food distribution, revolted when they heard about the new tax imposed by Theodosios I. Infuriated at the news of the revolt, the emperor sent officials to punish the citizens. Flavian, bishop of Antioch, brought in a band of Syriac-speaking monks from their caves in the desert around Silpios into the city, to intervene on Antioch's behalf. Their leader, Makedonios, successfully pleaded for the citizens of Antioch before the imperial officials.¹⁷²

Already in 385 monks were carrying out a systematic campaign against pagan temples. For example, they were behind the destruction of the statue of Asklepios in Berroia and of the temple at Edessa.¹⁷³ One must view the laws dating from 390 and 392, forbidding the monks access to cities and interference in judicial cases, within this context.¹⁷⁴ In fact, another piece of evidence for the increase in the number of the Christian population is the laws issued against paganism and schismatic Christians, many of them are allocated in the 16th Book of the *Theodosian Code*. The laws reflect the mentalities of the officials who issued them, in particular the quaestors. As Honoré notes, although the laws were written as if the emperor had had the idea himself, in the first person plural, in actual fact the urge came from the bishops, holy men and prefects, perhaps filtered through pious imperial ladies. Ultimately however, they were put in writing by the quaestors who were lawyers.¹⁷⁵ The foundations of quaestorship went back to the reign of Constantine, however it grew in importance in the fourth century: already by 380 quaestors shared the same status with the four top-ranking *illustres*. By the fifth century they started drafting laws and had become modern equivalents of the minister of justice.¹⁷⁶ The person in charge of the issue of the law 16.3.1 is identified as Aurelianus, a Christian quaestor who built the shrine of St Stephen the Protomartyr. In view of other laws dating from his quaestorship, Aurelianus "is not only harsh against dissident

¹⁷¹ Stevenson, *Creeds, Councils and Controversies*, pp. 398ff.

¹⁷² M. Maas, "People and Identity in Roman Antioch", in *Antioch. The Lost Ancient City*, ed. C. Kondoleon (Princeton, 2000), p.19; Liebeschuetz, *Antioch*, p. 237.

¹⁷³ Liebeschuetz, *Antioch*, p. 237.

¹⁷⁴ CTh. 16.3.1; 16.3.2 and 9.40.16. Cited in Liebeschuetz, *Antioch*, p. 235.

¹⁷⁵ T. Honoré, *Law in the Crisis of Empire (379-455). The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors with a Palingenesia of Laws of the Dynasty* (Oxford, 1988), p. 133. where he refers to a passage by Sozomen on the role of pious imperial women.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-16.

Christians but also against pagan practices."¹⁷⁷ This is not the end of the story. Aurelianus was urban prefect of Constantinople during 393-394 and two times Praetorian Prefect of the East, for whom the Senate at Constantinople erected a golden statue in recognition of his services¹⁷⁸ - not unlike Flavius Rufinus, the *magister officiorum* from southern Aquitaine who replaced Tatianus, prefect of the East in 392, murdering Tatianus' son Proculus, who had been the prefect of Constantinople since 388. Rufinus was a devoted Christian who kept close relations with Ambrose, bishop of Milan. Holum thinks that he was responsible for the promulgation of CTh 16.10-12 forbidding the burning of incense to pagan gods.¹⁷⁹ He is also referred to in the *vita* of St Hypatios, whose tomb was at the monastery he founded on his estate called Rouphinianai at Chalcedon, which he staffed with monks from Egypt.

The Christianisation of the capital and its adornment with churches, *martyria* and monasteries have to be seen within this context. After all, to a certain extent architecture and institutions are reflections of the "mentalities" of the people who created them. The earliest churches of St Irene, St Akakios and St Mokios were built during the reign of Constantine. Following Constantine's reign there seems to have been an upsurge in particularly imperial involvement in church building in the fifth century. The Topkapı Sarayı Basilica is dated to roughly the middle of the fifth century, a contemporary of the church of the Stoudios monastery outside the Constantinian walls, as well as the church of Theotokos ton Kyrou which was built almost certainly by Kyros, the Praetorian Prefect (439-441). While tradition attributes the churches of Blachernai, Chalkoprateia and Hodegoi to Augusta Pulcheria, they were actually built by Empress Verina, wife of Leo I (457-74). These three churches as well as the increase in the number of other churches and monasteries dedicated to Virgin Mary increasingly after the fifth century point to aspects of Christianisation in the city, particularly the promotion of Virgin Mary as the protectress of Constantinople - "Theotokoupolis".¹⁸⁰ The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* (ca. 425) refers to fourteen churches in the administrative

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-73.

¹⁷⁸ *PLRE* I, pp. 128-129.

¹⁷⁹ Holum, *Theodosian Emperors*, pp. 14-20. For Rufinus, see *PLRE* I, pp. 778-781, esp. 780-781 where he is referred to as a "pious Christian" baptised at Constantinople.

¹⁸⁰ For the early churches see Mango, *Le développement*, pp. 35-36. Also see, T. Mathews, *Early Churches of Constantinople*, pp. 11-14, 18. For the churches of Blachernai, Hodegoi and Chalkoprateia, see C. Angelidi, "Une texte patriographique et édifiant: le 'discours narratif' sur les Hodegoi", *RÉB* 52 (1994), pp. 113-149; *eadem*, "The Veneration of the Virgin Hodegetria and the Hodegon Monastery", in *Mother of God*, ed. M. Vassilaki (Athens, 2001), pp. 373-387; C. Mango, "The Origins of the Blachernae Shrine at Constantinople" *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae. Studi di Antichità Cristiana Pubblicati a Cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana. Vresnik za Archeologiju i Historiju Dalmatinsku*, Supl. vol. 87-89, pp. 61-76; C. Mango, "Constantinople as Theotokoupolis", in *Mother of God*, ed. M. Vassilaki (Athens, 2001), pp. 17-25. See also V. Limberis, *Divine Heiress* (London and New York, 1994), p. 57, on images of Pulcheria's piety.

regions of the city. All the regions except for the first, third, fifth, sixth and the twelfth have at least one church or *martyrion*.¹⁸¹ However, in these regions as well Christian buildings were soon to follow, as in the twelfth region, where the church of St John the Forerunner was built about forty years later. Not a single monastery features in the *Notitia*. This might be because monasteries were not public buildings like the churches and the baths, which seem to have been the primary concern of its compilers, or because of the identification of the monasteries with the houses/*domi*: monasteries might lurk behind the appellation *domus*.¹⁸² Yet there might be another, more important reason for their absence in the *Notitia*. Most of the early monasteries were founded outside the Constantinian walls, some of which were integrated into the city when the Theodosian walls were built in 413.¹⁸³ Now, the *Notitia*, as we have it, is taken to be a "Propagandaschrift" of the Theodosian dynasty, probably a later interpolation of the original which possibly dates from the reign of Arkadios (395-408).¹⁸⁴ Berger argues that the *Notitia* mentions the Theodosian walls in the latest edition but ignores the area between the new and the old walls when it comes to the arrangement of the regions, repeating the plan mainly of the city of Constantine. If true, this largely accounts for the absence of references to monasteries in the text: monasteries were not mentioned because the area where most of them were located was not included in the *Notitia*.¹⁸⁵

Overall, the process which began under the first emperors continued during the following centuries with additional vigour until finally Christianity became one of the definitive characters of the empire. Following the single short upsurge of paganism under Julian (361-363), there was no turning back after the late fourth century, particularly following the reign of Theodosios I (379-395), a trend which was visible in other parts of the empire as well.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸¹ See *NotCP*. Also see Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. xii.

¹⁸² The ones within the Theodosian walls, Dalmatou and Diou (possibly in the 12th or 9th regions), are possible examples of this.

¹⁸³ Mango, *Le développement*, pp. 49-50; *idem*, "Development of Constantinople", p. 125. See also P. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale. Études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines* (Paris, 1996), p. 27, including map, pp. 106-108.

¹⁸⁴ As a result, the later stages cannot be clearly distinguished from the previous ones. See A. Berger, "Regionen und Strassen im frühen Konstantinopel", *IstMitt* 47 (1997), pp. 350-351.

¹⁸⁵ The arguments center upon the discussion of the Fourteenth Region. *Ibid.*, pp. 351, 374. Mango, on the other hand, thinks that *Notitia* does include the area between the two walls. See Mango, *Le développement*, pp. 46-47; *idem*, "The Fourteenth Region of Constantinople", in *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldeshot, 1993), VIII, p. 1.

¹⁸⁶ Only in Egypt the Christianisation process started about a century later (450-550) than was the case elsewhere. Trombley argues that for the conversion of the temples to churches the memories of the old cult need not die out completely. Hence, paganism was not completely wiped out by the end of the fourth century. The main instigator of the process was the support the state rendered to the local bishops, allowing them to use the state treasury to convert the temples into churches which slowly made the believers of the old cults lose faith in the power of their religion. See Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianisation*, vol I, pp. 24, 114-115 for the importance of the state and local bishops in this process. For the trends in different parts of the empire see *ibid.*, vol II: for Asia Minor in particular, pp. 74-133. Also see the article on Athens by A. Frantz, "From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens", *DOP* 19 (1965), pp. 187-205.

IV. i. Monks as Convicts: The Trial of Eutychios (448-451).

A brief look at the situation during and in the aftermath of the council of Ephesus of 431, including the trial of 448-449 (known as the *Latrocinium* or Robber Council), until the Council of Chalcedon will show the important role the monks played in ecclesiastical politics at the time. Constantinopolitan monks took precedence, not only because the main actor in the controversy that led to the council of Ephesus was Nestorios, Archbishop of Constantinople (428-431), but also because the trial of 448-449 concerned a monk from Constantinople, Eutychios. A brief summary may also serve as a quick but informative glimpse at the relationship between the clergy, the monks, the emperor and the senior officials of the time, which in fact appears to be a complex network evidenced from the multitude of letters, agents, bribes, threats, etc. exchanged over wide distances.¹⁸⁷

The Council of Nicaea had tackled the difficult task of defining the creed of Christian faith, to which the Second Council at Constantinople did not make any major alterations.¹⁸⁸ Overall, there was no dissension against the premises of the first two ecumenical councils. With the third and the fourth councils however, the situation changed. The controversy, which started in the fifth century and was fervently discussed at the ecumenical councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), focused on the definition and the internal relation of the two natures of Christ. To the orthodox the human and the divine coexisted in Christ to the same full degree; any belief openly arguing or insinuating a position other than this was considered heretical. It was mainly the difference between the theologies of Alexandria and Antioch that lay at the core of the dispute. This becomes evident particularly during the controversy over Nestorios, a Syrian monk originally from Antioch who was appointed as Archbishop of Constantinople in 428. Ironically, it was Nestorios who urged emperor Theodosios II to "give me the earth without heresy and I will give heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians."¹⁸⁹ He received his theological education at Antioch where he was a student of Theodore of Mopsuestia, from whom he learned the objections to the title "Theotokos" for Virgin Mary. It seems that when making

¹⁸⁷ The sources are Theodoret (Letters), pp. 250-348; Nestorios, *The Bazaar: The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, trans. M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2000); Zachariah of Mitylene, *The Syriac Chronicle of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F.J. Hamilton and E.W. Brooks (London, 1899); John of Nikiu, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. R.H. Charles (London, 1916); Severus, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus*, trans. E.W. Brooks, 2 vols. (London, 1904). The most informative secondary source is the article by H. Bacht, "Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431-519)", in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, eds. H. Bacht and A. Grillmeier, vol. II (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 193-314. For the events of the council of Ephesus and the theology of Cyril of Alexandria, see J. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy, its History, Theological Texts* (Leiden, 1994).

¹⁸⁸ For the differences between the two councils, see G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (London, 1991), pp. 170-171.

this objection he actually had in mind the Arian position, i.e., Christ, inferior to the Father. He believed, therefore, that "Mary the God-bearer had to be balanced by Mary bearer of man because Christ was both God and Man". Hence the title "Christotokos".¹⁹⁰

Nestorios' main opponent at the council was Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, who defended the proposition that "Christ is *out of* two natures after the incarnation and one *hypostasis*, one person".¹⁹¹ At the council of Chalcedon, however, the key wording was changed from "out of two natures" to "in two natures" by Pope Leo. Upon this, many Cyrillians in Egypt and Syria, thinking that this was a betrayal of Cyril's theology, separated into Monophysitism.¹⁹²

Before the council, Cyril was trying to draw support from among the ranks of the clergy, elites and monks. At home in Alexandria, for example, he was in trouble with Orestes, eparch of the city, against whom he was helped by the monks from Nitria who had come to Alexandria to defend him. On one occasion the monks surrounded Orestes' vehicle and intimidated him by shaking and jostling it and at another time by showering him with stones one of which hit him wounding his head. Orestes took revenge by torturing one of the monks, presumably the one who had thrown at him the "fatal" stone, eventually killing the monk whom Cyril proclaimed a martyr.¹⁹³

The court officials and, likewise, the bishops were divided into two groups, one supporting Nestorios and the other Cyril.¹⁹⁴ Pope Celestine, Memnon of Ephesus, Juvenal of Jerusalem were among the powerful supporters of the Alexandrians which amounted to about two hundred bishops in total. Already before Ephesus, Nestorios was condemned at local councils convened at Rome and Alexandria in August and November of 430 respectively. Nestorios' wise plan of convening the council at home in Constantinople had failed, and with the final decision taken at Ephesus, situated far away from the bishoprics of his supporters, his future was already doomed. To Nestorios support mainly came from John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Andrew of Samosata, Theodore of Mopsuestia and some other eastern bishoprics including Melitene and Ankyra, totalling forty-three bishops. In Constantinople, however, the greatest support came from emperor Theodosios and Nestorios' personal friend and bodyguard at Ephesus, the *comes* Irenaeus. Theodosios sent Candidatus together with a

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.* See also, McGuckin. *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, p. 28.

¹⁹¹ McGuckin. *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 230-232.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 238.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13. Nestorios accuses Cyril of gathering monks against himself. *The Bazaar*, p. 96.

supply of soldiers to prevent atrocities, protect the intimidated archbishop and to make sure that the council convened *after* the arrival of the eastern bishops. Not everybody at the court supported Nestorios however. His primary adversary in the city was Augusta Pulcheria. Concerning her adverse attitude, Nestorios blames Cyril as usual, without failing to mention in passing, however, that his relationship with the Augusta was already failing before Cyril's interference.¹⁹⁵ He does not seem to have had any supporters among the monks of the city either. Dalmatios, the leader of the monks, collaborated with Cyril, which is apparent from the letters exchanged between him, Cyril and the council.¹⁹⁶ Nestorios devotes a long section to the situation in Constantinople and the role played by the monks before his arrival at the city as Archbishop, an account which apparently was inspired by the acts of the council of Ephesus (the same which the hagiographer of Dalmatios seems to have used). In this section he openly states that after Sissinos (426-427), Theodosios offered the archbishopric first to Dalmatios, and then to another monk of the city, whom he does not name, both of whom refused. Secondly, because nobody agreed upon an archbishop from among the clergy or the monks of the city, Theodosios decided to make his own decision and appointed a well-reputed person from outside the city. Thirdly, he blames Dalmatios for uniting all the monks against him and for convincing Theodosios in his cause.¹⁹⁷

The council met before the arrival of the eastern bishops and condemned Nestorios on 22 June, four days before the arrival of the bishops who decided to convene their own mini-council (known as the *Conciliabulum*) at which they counter-condemned Cyril and his famous Twelve Chapters. At first the emperor did not accept either council; however, the bishops who convened in June once again condemned Nestorios together with the eastern bishops who supported him. For one last time in late August of the same year Theodosios invited a group of delegates from both groups to meet at Rouphinianai,¹⁹⁸ at Chalcedon next to the monastery

¹⁹⁴ See Nestorios' letter to Cyril: "Thou hast all the support of the Empire. ...but I, who had the chief men and the Emperor and the episcopate of Constantinople... was harassed by thee so as to be driven out; and thou wast bishop of Alexandria and thou didst get hold of the church of Constantinople...." *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁵ Obviously, Nestorios made a foolish mistake in denying the title *parthena* to Pulcheria. *The Bazaar*, pp. 96-97.

¹⁹⁶ *ACO* I, 2, p. 66 for an example.

¹⁹⁷ *The Bazaar*, pp. 272-277.

¹⁹⁸ From the letters Cyril sent from Constantinople we learn that because the monks blocked entry to Constantinople the meeting took place at Chalcedon. See *ACO* I, 7, p. 76:

"Παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν Χαλκηδόνα (εἰς γὰρ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν οὔτε ἡμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἐναντίοι συνεχωρήθημεν εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τὰς στάσεις τῶν καλῶν μοναζόντων). ..." Theodoret mentions the same event, but unlike Cyril, he refers to the "bad monks": "We, however, alike at Ephesus and here, have been for a long time deprived of communion; alike here and there have undergone innumerable perils; and while we were being stoned and all but slain by slaves dressed up as monks, we took it all for the best, as willingly enduring such treatment in the cause of the truth." Theodoret (Letters), p. 339. It is not clear whether these were Constantinopolitan monks or not.

of Hypatios. Not surprisingly, Nestorios was deposed yet again. With his ardent collaborator John of Antioch agreeing to depose and anathematise him in 433, Nestorios' final support for returning to Constantinople faded away. Hopeless, he lays the burden on Theodosios' shoulders, blaming him for having turned his back on his bishop, and for having given in to the bribes of Cyril, that is, quite openly, for having "sold" him.¹⁹⁹

After the deposition of Nestorios, Maximian was appointed to the see of Constantinople, followed in 434 by Proklos. In Alexandria, Dioskoros succeeded Cyril after his death in 444. In Antioch, Domnos was appointed as patriarch in 441. Leo I governed the see of Rome. Among the five most important bishops of the empire, only Juvenal of Jerusalem was allowed to remain on the patriarchal throne. Theodoret, who was originally from Antioch and a friend of Nestorios, and like him a student of Theodore of Mopsuestia, left a large collection of letters with valuable references to the important events of his time. He was also a friend of Irenaeus who was appointed to the metropolitan see of Tyre by Domnos. These were the leading actors that played an important role at the trial of Eutychios, successor to the title of the chief of the monasteries of Constantinople, which Dalmatios held before him. Like Dalmatios, Eutychios was part of this network. Unlike Dalmatios, however, he never became a saint; on the contrary, his name entered the black book of heretics and he was condemned at every council.

Eutychios was the godfather of Chrysaphios, the powerful eunuch at the palace, who might have been the person behind the fall of the ex-eparch of the city, Kyros.²⁰⁰ Dioskoros had a close relationship with Chrysaphios, who was supported by Theodosios but disliked by Pulcheria. Also, Eutychios, Dioskoros and Chrysaphios blamed Domnos for the consecration of Irenaeus. The details of who supported whom and for what reason are quite elusive. It is safe to assume that the monks were not simply supplicating God incessantly in their cells. They knew the people at the court, and had established close relations with several bishops. Initially Eutychios had the backing of the emperor and the chief eunuch; however, he failed to "convince" Leo of Rome (440-461), Flavian of Constantinople (446-449), Domnos of Antioch, and his fellow monks in Constantinople. In the absence of the support of his greatest benefactor, Theodosios II, who died in 450, he was doomed to fail.

The trial of Eutychios took place between 12 November 448 and 27 April 449. It is preserved among the acts of the council of Chalcedon, where the final decision and

¹⁹⁹ *The Bazaar*, p. 279.

²⁰⁰ See Sid ris, *Eunuques et pouvoir   Byzance*, pp. 365-369 for Chrysaphios. Kyros was blamed for being pagan and all his property was confiscated.

condemnation of Eutychios took place. Between late 448 and 451 the case of Eutychios remained high on the agenda. There is a whole pile of letters exchanged between Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch; between patriarchs, bishops, imperial officials including emperor Theodosios, and after his death, Marcian, and Augusta Pulcheria, as well as monks of Constantinople and of other cities. One can easily trace from Nestorios' *Bazaar of Heracleides*, and from the letters of Theodoret, that the trial of Eutychios had wide repercussions. Theodoret, for example, remained in contact with some of the monks in Constantinople who were opponents of Eutychios. Obviously, distance did not prevent bishops or monks from involving themselves in Eutychios' case, not unlike that of Nestorios.

In April 449, Eutychios was deposed for the first time. However, the matter did not rest at that. He wrote to Theodosios, complaining that his deposition had not been carried out canonically. Upon Theodosios' orders, in August of the same year another council, the so called *Latrocinium* or Robber Council met in Ephesus, vindicating Eutychios and condemning all his opponents, particularly Archbishop Flavian and Eusebios of Doryleon. Thus far Eutychios had the backing of emperor Theodosios and of his godson Chrysaphios, the *cubicularius*. After the council, however, the wheels of fortune started turning against Eutychios once more. His great supporters melted away: emperor Theodosios died in July 450, Augusta Pulcheria married Marcian, and they deposed/executed Chrysaphios. Not long after, the new emperor and empress decided that a new ecumenical council should meet and set things right. As a result, at the Council of Chalcedon, the ultimate decision on the case was made, whereby Eutychios was accused and condemned as a heretic.

What he actually believed in and whether he really was a heretic is another matter. What seems to be the case is that he was blamed for denying one of the two natures of Christ, precisely, for refusing to admit that Christ's manhood was complete. Regardless of its theological assertions, for our purposes the trial is important mainly because its account contains the first list of Constantinopolitan monasteries. Eutychios' trial starts on the 12th of November after Patriarch Flavian sends deacon Andreas and the *ekdikos* John to the monastery of Eutychios, which, as we learn from the letters of Pope Leo to Augusta Pulcheria, was "dangerously" close to the city, probably at Hebdomon outside the Theodosian walls and had about 300 monks.²⁰¹ However, Eutychios refuses to attend the council, sending word "that it is in no way possible for me to leave my monastery, for I live here as in a

²⁰¹ Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 207. Bacht seems to have no objection to the number of monks. I believe it cannot be more than a tenth of the proposed number. However, there is no proof, as is usually the case.

grave".²⁰² Although he refuses to leave the monastery, the synod finds out later that he does not remain idle and spends his time preparing *libelloi*/letters/petitions which he sends to monasteries in and outside the city, apparently, urging the monks to support him against the synod. In order to learn the contents of the letter, to whom it was sent, and the names of the monks who agreed to collaborate with Eutychios, the synod first orders Abramios, abbot of another monastery/*martyrion* at Hebdomon, possibly the closest neighboring monastery to that of Eutychios, to attend the court. Abramios tells them that he had received a letter but through another abbot in the city, that is, from Manouelios, who in turn received it from yet another abbot, Asterios. Possibly, then, Eutychios had managed to send his letter to all the hegoumenoi of Constantinople. Upon this, Flavian decides to send officials to the monasteries in and around Constantinople. Presbyter Petros and deacon Patrikios are sent to monasteries inside the city; presbyter Rhetorios and deacon Eutropios to monasteries in Sykai, and finally, the presbyters Paul and John to monasteries in Chalcedon.²⁰³

Meanwhile, the synod sends presbyters Mamas and Theophilos once more to the monastery of Eutychios, urging him yet again to come and answer the accusations before the synod. Mamas reports the details of what had happened when he and Theophilos went to see Eutychios. They enter through the gates of Eutychios' monastery and tell the monks why they have come and that they want to see the abbot. The monks, however, reply that abbot Eutychios "is not well and cannot see anybody". When Mamas and Theophilos insist that they have to deliver Eutychios the letter from the synod in person, the monks give in. Eutychios however, repeats what he had said before: "I made a testament that I am not leaving the monastery unless there is a serious compulsion. Both the Holy Synod and the God-loving archbishop know that I am a sick, old man. Let them do whatever they see fit."²⁰⁴

The next day (16th of November), Abramios comes uninvited to the synod together with three monks from the monastery of Eutychios to defend him, bearing testimony that "He is sick, he moaned all night, he did not sleep, neither did I."²⁰⁵ Obviously, Abramios had spent the night beside Eutychios.

On the 17th of November the officials who had been sent to report on their visits to other hegoumenoi of the Constantinopolitan monasteries return, which tells us they could visit these monasteries in a single day.²⁰⁶ Their report is this. Monks Martinos of Dios and Faustos

²⁰² *ACO* II, 4, p. 124, lines 15ff.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 125-127.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 128.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 130.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 131.

of Dalmatios deny consenting to the letter of Eutychios. Faustos tells the officials that "we also are the children of the church and have one father in the *archiepiskopos* after God."²⁰⁷ It is not surprising that Faustos and Martinos refused to collaborate with Eutychios. We know that Faustos was the abbot of the monastery of Dalmatios, the "mother monastery" in Constantinople. According to Bacht, Faustos was competing with Eutychios, who was trying to create a schism between the church hierarchy and the monks over the leadership of Constantinopolitan monasteries.²⁰⁸ Other abbots, Job, Manouelios and Abramios, say they have not received any letter, nor did they personally hear anything from Eutychios on the issue.²⁰⁹

Eutychios is given an ultimatum to attend the meeting on the 22nd of November. The officials who convey the letter of ultimatum discuss the creed with Eutychios and report to the synod the outcome of the discussion which took place at his monastery. Despite their efforts in trying to convince Eutychios on the patriarchate's position, that is, "Christ is out of two natures after the incarnation, one *hypostasis* and one person," Eutychios, being persistent in defending "in two natures", is blamed for having fallen into the heresies of Valentios and Apollinarios.²¹⁰ He does not consent to comply with the synod's version, saying "I do not agree with two natures; let the monastery be my tomb and let me suffer the worst if God agrees to it".²¹¹

On the 22nd of November Eutychios appears before the gates of the secretariat of the patriarchate, accompanied by bodyguards and soldiers, representatives of the praetorian prefect and a certain Magnus, *silentarius*, who was sent by the emperor. Apparently, Theodosios wanted to show his backing for the abbot. Also present were Makedonios, tribune and *referendarius*, and Florentius, a patrician.²¹² Constantine, Eleusinius and another Constantine, all monks from the monastery of Eutychios, bring in the letter which he formerly sent to the emperor (which explains why he was surrounded by bodyguards) and ask the letter to be read out loud. In the letter Eutychios blames Flavian for devising a false accusation

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 133.

²⁰⁸ Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 212 But what could he gain by this? He must have had a more tangible aim in mind.

²⁰⁹ *ACO* II, 1, p. 134.

²¹⁰ This is the position agreed upon at Chalcedon. Cyril of Alexandria was, in practice, against it, but in theory he believed it too was orthodox depending on how it was defined. It seems, then, that the letters Eutychios sent to the monks were on this aspect of the creed. He did not agree with Ephesus and wanted to draw the monks to his side. "In two natures", however, was accepted at Chalcedon. Strictly on this issue he was a Chalcedonian before Chalcedon.

²¹¹ *ACO* II, 1, p. 140.

²¹² Florentius was an orthodox Christian, who in 428 had given his own property to the state to compensate for revenue lost by the closure of brothels in Constantinople. Apparently, Theodosios had trusted his judgement and sent him to the council to investigate the views of Eutychios. On Florentius, see *PLRE* II, pp. 478-450.

against him and urges the emperor not to believe in his machinations.²¹³ Against this letter, the monks Andreas, John and Athanasios bear testimony that they have held a conversation with Eutychios which convinced them that he was really a heretic who denied the decisions of the council of Ephesus and the human nature of Christ.²¹⁴ The synod then proceeds with the interrogation of Eutychios, who defends himself and claims that nothing he has said or written was against the canons of the holy fathers.²¹⁵ However, he fails to convince the synod, which blames him for blaspheming against Christ and acting against the holy order governing the church and the leaders of the monasteries. Thirty bishops proclaimed and signed, followed by twenty- three monks from Constantinople or its vicinity who only "signed" for the condemnation of Eutychios: Andreas, Faustos (Dalmatou), Martinos (Diou), Manouelios, Petros (Thalassiou), Job, Antiochos (Theoteknou), Abramios, Theodore, Theodore (Aegyption), Pientios (Nepion), Flavian (Ermaou), Eusebios (Elia), Eusebios (Eulogiou), Tryphon, Jacob (Syron), Elpidios, Paul (Aithriou), Karosos, Asterios (Laurentiou), Kallinikos (Theodotou), Germanos, Markellos (Akoimeton).²¹⁶

Only Abramios and three other monks from the monastery of Eutychios attended the synod's early meetings. Reports about the investigations of Manuelios, Martinos, Faustos, Petros and Job are given by the officials at the synod. Of these, Faustos, Martinos, Petros, Manuelios, Job, Antiochos, Abramios, Theodore, Pientios, Eusebios, Elpidios, Paul, Asterios, Karosos and Jacob collaborated with the Pope, which is evidenced in a letter Leo sent them.²¹⁷ Faustos and Martinos were among Leo's most regular correspondents; others include Flavian, Theodosios, Pulcheria, Julian of Kos (who signed for the depostion of Eutychios), Theodore of Cyrrihus (who was in contact with Markellos, Job and Andreas as well as Pulcheria, Flavian and Florentius in Constantinople)²¹⁸, Galla Placidia and Licinia Eudoxia.²¹⁹

We are not given a detailed separate list of the monks and monasteries at Pera or Chalcedon even though the synod did send officials to those parts. Only for Markellos is there evidence that suggests he was from a monastery under the jurisdiction of the bishop of

²¹³ *ACO* II, 1, p. 156.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 162-163.

²¹⁵ Appears to be so from what he says in *ACO* II, 1, p. 168 lines 25-34.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 145-147. Also see Dagron, "Les moines et la ville", pp. 240-242.

²¹⁷ *ACO* II, 4, pp. 31-32; Bacht, "Die Rolle", pp. 233-235.

²¹⁸ Theodore (Letters), p. 264 (to Pulcheria); p. 287 (to Flavian); p. 283 (to Florentius); p. 300 (to Job); p. 309 (to Markellos); p. 310 (to Andreas) and pp. 312-316 to monks of Constantinople, written after the death of Theodosios and his return from exile back to Cyrrihus. The letter he sent to Job, obviously after the trial, reads: "In our wars for true religion's sake you are ... championing the cause of the gospel doctrines, and putting your men in the shade of the vigour of your spirit. I rejoice to hear it, and am glad, and long to embrace your right venerable grey hairs..."

²¹⁹ For Leo's letters dating from this period, see *PL* 54.

Chalcedon (if, of course, this is the Markellos from the monastery of the Akoimetoi, as is most likely). By 448-449, the monastery was at Irenaion across Sosthenion along the Bosphoros. However, apart from a letter of Theodoret of Cyrrihus addressed to him as the hegoumenos of the Akoimetoi, there is no evidence, particularly in view of the fact that Markellos' *vita* does not refer at all to his presence at the trial of Eutychios, or to the trial for that matter.

In any case, this is the only comprehensive list that we have of the Constantinopolitan monasteries from the fifth century because the final session in April 449 does not include the names of abbots. Fragments of the *Latrocinium Council* (August 449) survive in Syriac; monks from Constantinople were present there but their names are not given.²²⁰ Finally at Chalcedon, only the names of the bishops are given, there is no word on the monks. This, of course, is not unusual, since monks did not *officially* participate in an ecumenical council before 787, the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Seen from this angle, the fact that monks were present at a synod and gave their signatures, *even if not at its final/decisive session*, is extraordinary, as Eutychios himself pointed out in a letter he sent to Pope Leo I.²²¹

There are a couple of issues that await resolution. Eutychios was against the decisions of the Council of Ephesus and was trying to draw the monks to his side. If this is true, then one has to explain why he waited so long to express his discontent. I believe, therefore, that he was in fact against Flavian and used the council as a pretext. Why, then, did he remain silent during the archbishoprics of Maximian and Proklos: in other words, what was "special" about Flavian? Was he planning to replace the archbishop by nominating somebody else; or, as is more likely, was Flavian so weak that, in his deposition, Eutychios saw his own chance of becoming the archbishop?²²² What he actually intended to do by trying to unite the Constantinopolitan monks against Flavian is open to discussion; however, it is clear that by trying to make all the monks sign his *libellos* against an ecumenical council he was exceeding his "monastic" limits; monks were not allowed to make such decisions, or proclaim against those of an ecumenical council, or, for that matter, the decisions of any council.²²³ Judging

²²⁰ Bacht. "Die Rolle", p.216, n.108.

²²¹ "...Sed nullo eorum quae a me dicebantur audito. abrupta synodo publicaverunt dejectionis cognitionem parabant: in tantum adversum me culminae factione instruebant, ut et saluti meae dicrimen incumberet, nisi cito opera Dei orationibus tuae. militaris manus me ab incursione rapuisset. *Tunc duces aliorum monasteriorum cogere coeperunt in dejectionem meam subscribere (quod numquam nec in eos qui se haereticos professi sunt, vel adversus ipsum Nestorium factum est)*, in tantum ut cum ad satisfaciendum plebi proponderem fidei mea confessiones..." *PL*. vol. 54 Epistola ad Eutychem. col. 717A. See also P. Karlin-Hayter, "A Byzantine Politician Monk: Saint Theodore Studite", *JÖB* 44 (1994), p. 218.

²²² Suggested by Sidéris, *Eunuques et pouvoir à Byzance*, p. 365.

²²³ In fact, this is what Martinos is reported to have replied to Eutychios: "μή εἶναι ἔμῳ τὸ ὑπογράφεῖν, ἐπίσκοπον δὲ μόνον." *ACO* II, 1, p. 133.

from the objection he had formerly raised in the letter to the Pope, one can argue that in fact he knew the rules and regulations and yet, despite his knowledge, was confident enough to incite the monks against Flavian. It is, therefore, possible that he was supported by Theodosios who may have proposed the archbishopric to Eutychios.

Returning back to the list of monasteries, one might claim that it does not include the names of the monks who were supporting Eutychios. There may have been another group which supported Eutychios, as Nestorios clearly distinguishes between the two groups, one supporting Flavian and the other Eutychios.²²⁴ Unfortunately, the solution to the problem, the acts of *Latrocinium*, which might have provided us with the names of Eutychios' supporters, do not survive. At the *Latrocinium*, Eusebios of Doryleum, Domnos of Edessa, Theodoret, and of course Flavian were expelled from their sees for having acted against Nicaea and Ephesus.²²⁵ Flavian was not simply expelled; he was badly beaten, probably by a group of Syrian monks brought in by Barsumas, their leader, and died two days after the event.²²⁶ On 13 October 449, Leo started the first set of actions, attempting to change the scale of events to his advantage after the *Latrocinium*. He sent a number of letters to Constantinople, to Pulcheria, Theodosios and "the clergy and the people of Constantinople", and another set to the monks Faustos, Martinos, Manuelios and Petros.²²⁷ No one was appointed to the archbishopric from the end of August until Anatolios' election in November.²²⁸ At the beginning of March 450, Leo received replies to his letters from Constantinople, Pulcheria, Theodosios, Martinos and Faustos.²²⁹ A turn of events came with the death of Theodosios on 28 July. Immediately after his death, Chrysaphios was removed from office.

The list is also useful in enabling us to make general observations on the nature of monasteries and their locations in fifth-century Constantinople. First of all, one can easily notice that almost all monasteries are named after their founders like, Dalmatou, Diou, Thalassiou, Theodotou, Eulogiou, etc. Among them, for example, Job signs here as the hegoumenos of his monastery which will reappear in the list of 518 as "the monastery of Job". Secondly, the appellations for monasteries such as "the Egyptians" and "the Syrians" point to the importance of the eastern monks among the early monastic establishments of the city. As we shall see in the list of 518, some of them did not even speak Greek. One should, of course,

²²⁴ *The Bazaar*, pp. 351-352. The reference is actually to the *Latrocinium*.

²²⁵ Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 228.

²²⁶ *Ibid.* Namely, on August, 24.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

²²⁸ V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople de 715 à 1206*, 2nd ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1989), I, p. 98.

²²⁹ Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 233.

remember the references in the *vita* of Alexander Akoimetos to monks from different areas of the east and also the case of St Daniel the Stylite, who likewise did not speak Greek when he first came to Constantinople. Thirdly, most of these monasteries were founded either outside the Theodosian walls or in the less populated region between the Theodosian and Constantinian walls. Others were founded in Sykai, Bosphoros or Chalcedon. One should note that these two were areas where many wealthy Constantinopolitans had their houses or *proasteia*. The monasteries of Eutychios, Abramios and the Egyptians, for example, were outside the Theodosian walls, and those of Dios and Dalmatios were in the area between the two walls. Exact locations of many of the early foundations, however, remain unknown.

The details evade us; however, the fact remains that it is largely the same body of monks and the monasteries they represented in 448 that reappear 70 years later on another list in a petition to John II, patriarch of Constantinople, against the monophysite bishop Severos. Chrysaphios and Theodosios made Eutychios' monastery the leader of Constantinopolitan monasteries; Pulcheria and Marcian organized the council which condemned him as a heretic, consigning Eutychios and his followers to condemnation. His case, therefore, might be interpreted as an early sign that monks and monasteries depended on imperial and/or aristocratic patronage to survive in Constantinople, and that, particularly during this early period, they had to comply with the "orthodoxy of the emperors". Yet one also has to note the effort the court had put into trying to draw the majority of the monks to its side, since, obviously, the monks were instrumental in controlling the voices of the masses.²³⁰ It seems, therefore, that there was a complicated network of relationships between the court, the officials, the aristocrats, the monks and the people, one that was alternating between religion and politics, the ideals of the desert and the realities of "the City".

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 216-217. See also Gregory, *Vox Populi*, p. 25.

IV. ii. Monks as Prosecutors: The Councils of 518 and 536

As is evidenced above, all the major actors at the trial of Eutychios were deposed and anathematised at the council of Chalcedon, and all who were deposed by the *Latrocinium* were reinstated to their former positions. The Chalcedonian Creed, on the other hand, did not find empire-wide consent among the bishops. In fact, it marked a parting of ways between the eastern bishoprics and Constantinople which ultimately opted for imposing the Chalcedonian Creed as the epitome of orthodoxy. Basiliskos' reign (475-476) was a short respite for the anti-Chalcedonians. The *Encyclical* (475), the letter of an Alexandrian monk condemning the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, was issued with his consent. Apart from the *Enotikon* of emperor Zeno in 482, efforts at unifying the empire under the Chalcedonian Creed met fierce resistance. In addition, the *Enotikon* had triggered the controversy with Rome known as the Akakian Schism, named after Akakios, patriarch of Constantinople (472-489), which lingered on until the accession of Justin I in 518. Akakios tried to dissuade Basiliskos from issuing the *Encyclical*, and, having failed, he resisted it. In his resistance, he found the orthodox monasteries of Constantinople on his side. St Daniel the Stylite, for example, descended his column for his cause.²³¹ As long as he remained against the anti-Chalcedonian measures of the emperors, he could rely on the monks' support. Therefore, the *Enotikon* and his consent to it ignited resistance against him and emperor Zeno. In this resistance, the monks of Constantinople were led by the Akoimatoi and monks from the monastery of Dios who were united with the papacy headed at that time by Pope Felix (483-492). Thus, Tutus, the papal legate, met the monks at the monastery of Dios when he arrived at Constantinople carrying the decree of Akakios' excommunication. Felix also wrote a letter addressed to the leaders of the monasteries of Rufinus, Thalassios and other monks in Constantinople and Bithynia urging them to unite against Akakios.²³² After eighteen years under the rule of Anastasios, well known for his Monophysite tendencies, ultimately in the early sixth century, Constantinople resorted to using force, when the persecutions of anti-Chalcedonians started under Justin I (518-527). Hence, from 451, emperors Marcian, Leo I, Leo II, Zeno, Basiliskos, Anastasios I and Justin I experimented with all the possible options for dealing with the

²³¹ See I'. Daniel, pp. 67-70. All the monasteries in Constantinople supported him. Basiliskos, on the other hand, sent his officials to draw the saint to his side. Akakios sent Abraham from the monastery of St Kyriakos, Eusebios from the monastery "near the Exakionion", Athinodoros the Stoudite and Andreas the *deuterarios*. Bacht. "Die Rolle", pp. 269-270.

²³² Bacht. "Die Rolle", pp. 270-271.

disputes caused by the council. Finally Justin opted for imposing Chalcedonian orthodoxy.²³³ During this period, depending mainly on the affiliations of the court and the patriarchate, Constantinople changed sides, and perhaps as a direct consequence, the city lay open to influences from other sees. When Chalcedonian emperors and patriarchs were in power, Constantinople turned first to Rome, collaborating with the Pope and the patriarch of Jerusalem against the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. The latter two were centres of dissension against Chalcedon; therefore, when Monophysitism was favoured at the court, the influence of Alexandria and Antioch increased. One should note that a great number of the Monophysite monks and patriarchs, most of whom had initiated monastic life at monasteries in Antioch and Alexandria, came to the capital from the areas which were under the jurisdiction of these two sees.

In this network, monks in Constantinople, due to the sheer fact that they were in the capital, had a peculiar position. They knew their brothers in the capital well; at the same time, they were aware of what was going on in Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem or elsewhere. After all, although we do not know the exact number, certainly some of them came from those places. Just as monks were part of the religious and political scene in other cities, the monks in Constantinople influenced and were influenced by the decisions of the patriarchate and the court. It is probable that, during this era, monks in Constantinople were a mixed group who came from a variety of places and therefore belonged to different theological schools, especially those who had enough education to belong to a particular school. Their numbers and affiliations could have been affected by the changes in the court. To put it more precisely, just as the selection of the court officials and the patriarchs was influenced by the preferences of the court, the monastic topography of the city likewise showed variations according to the decisions of the court. This is not to say, however, that all monasteries in Constantinople were Monophysite under a Monophysite ruler and all were orthodox under an orthodox one. It only means that the reality was much more complex than is actually known from what the sources provide.

Zachariah of Mitylene implies that Basiliskos, Leo I's brother-in-law who usurped the throne when Zeno was away from the capital, was convinced by Timotheos Ailouros, Patriarch of Alexandria, to issue the *Encyclical* condemning Chalcedon, forwarded to all the bishops in the east. Zachariah wrote that "certain monks holding opinions similar to those of Eutychios, who happened to be in the royal city" tried to convince Timotheos into

²³³ For the period after Akakios' death and the ascension of Anastasios, see Bacht, "Die Rolle", pp. 274-275.

Eutychianism, and having failed to do so "the Eutychianists joining with their fellows, advised Zenona, the wife of emperor Basiliskos, a professor of their creed, that Timotheos should be banished again" in 477.²³⁴ Likewise, his successor Timotheos (477-482) was deposed and replaced by Peter Mongus (482-490) because "there were in Constantinople certain monks who were pleading for Peter".²³⁵ Were the monasteries in Constantinople as powerful as Zachariah portrays them? Were they supporters of Chalcedon or the Monophysites?

Patriarch Makedonios of Constantinople (496-511) was initially a figure disliked by both the Chalcedonian and the Monophysite parties. According to Evagrius, a Chalcedonian, his religious policies, parallel to the unifying spirit of the *Enotikon*, were not approved of by the monasteries in Constantinople and his silence on the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, despite his open condemnation of Nestorios and Eutychios, separated the "monasteries around Constantinople from Bishop Makedonios".²³⁶ Zachariah, Monophysite bishop of Mitylene, on the other hand, wrote that he was supported by the monasteries in Constantinople, especially by those of the Akoimetoï and Dalmatios: "This man [Makedonios] was attached to the monks of the monastery of the Akoimetoï, of whom there were about one thousand, and who lived luxuriously in baths and in other bodily indulgences, and outwardly appeared to men honourable, and were adorned with the semblance of chastity, but were inwardly like whited sepulchres, full of uncleanness."²³⁷ It seems that the discrepancy between the two accounts is mainly due to the changes in Makedonios' status and not due to his religious affiliations, which were in favour of union. Makedonios was disliked by the orthodox monasteries in the city until he was deposed by Anastasios. It is to this stage that Evagrius refers in the quotation above. After the deposition, however, he became a friend of the monasteries and an enemy of the emperor. Hence Zachariah's account of Makedonios as the collaborator with the Akoimetoï and Samuel, hegoumenos of Dalmatios:

"...concerning all that Macedonius did in the monastery of Dalmatus against the whole truth, God stirred up the spirit of the believing... We testify to you that after Macedonius did that of which we sent information to your Piety and anathematised those reprobate persons and the accursed council of 20th of July [511], there was on the 22nd a dedication festival at the Martyr church in the Hebdomon and the king himself was present. Neither he nor the queen would receive oblation from him; on the contrary he even addressed him in severe

²³⁴ Zachariah of Mitylene, p. 110. He is possibly referring to Chalcedonian monks and not "Eutychianists", simply because after Chalcedon monks could not claim to be Eutychianists and continue to live in Constantinople.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²³⁶ Evagrius Scholasticus, p. 171.

²³⁷ Zachariah of Mitylene, p. 168.

terms. But on the 24th the monks of this place went in and communicated in the church with Macedonius and the king was vexed with them for going in."²³⁸

We learn that certain Monophysite monks in the city, however, went to Patrikios, *magister militiae*, accusing the patriarch of Nestorianism, upon which the Chalcedonian monasteries of the city were punished by the emperor, who cut their water supply, and deprived them of the allowances from the treasury.²³⁹ Makedonios was deposed in August, after fourteen years of service under emperor Anastasios, who ruled for twenty-seven years. Is it then, as Zachariah wants us to believe, only Anastasios' Monophysite tendencies and Makedonios' collaboration with the Chalcedonian monasteries that led to his deposition? Above all, how does Anastasios end up being the Monophysite emperor and Makedonios the orthodox patriarch? Could there possibly be a link between all these and the presence of Severos of Antioch at the court in Constantinople between 508 and 511?²⁴⁰

Makedonios was replaced by Timotheos I, shortly after Severos left the city in October. Severos was appointed patriarch of Antioch in 512, the same year when a rebellion broke out in Constantinople against the Monophysite version of the "Trisagion". A year later, Vitalian, another *magister militiae* and a strong supporter of Chalcedon, rebelled against Anastasios. His good relations with Pope Hormisdas and his enmity toward Severos are well attested in the sources.²⁴¹ Although religion may not have been his sole motive, he must have gained considerable support from the Chalcedonians at the capital against Anastasios, who was now openly Monophysite. Outside the capital, likewise, Monophysites were gaining ascendancy after the 510s. Elias, Chalcedonian Patriarch of Jerusalem, was deposed in 516 and replaced by John. According to Evagrius, Flavian of Antioch was forced by monks from Syria Prima to sign against Chalcedon and the *Tome of Leo*, upon which other monks from the region of his former monastery came to defend him. Philoxenos, bishop of Maboug, travelled to Constantinople and managed to convince Anastasios to remove him.²⁴² After the appointment of John of Nikiu, who described Anastasios as "an orthodox believer [who]

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171.

²³⁹ *Ibid.* "And on the 25th a few brethren who seceded from these monks entered in and went to *stratelates* Patrick and gave him a libel to present to the king saying we declare that he celebrated the memory of Nestorius ...And they wrote other things against him...On that same day the king commanded that the water which supplied the baths was cut off from their monasteries, and only that which they drank was supplied to them. And also he took away the denarii which they used to receive from the treasury." On Patrikios, see *PLRE II*, pp. 840-841.

²⁴⁰ *Letters of Severos*, pp. vi-vii. Severos had come to Constantinople with about two hundred monks to complain about Nephaios, a Chalcedonian supported by Makedonios, who expelled Severos from his monastery. See Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 278. Immediately after Severos left the city, Chalcedonian monks from the Great Lavra in Palestine arrived to meet the emperor. *Ibid.*, p. 282.

²⁴¹ For Vitalian, see *PLRE II*, pp. 1171-1176.

²⁴² This according to Pseudo-Zachariah. See Evagrius Scholasticus, pp. 174-175 with notes.

prohibited the faith of the Chalcedonians", to the see of Alexandria in 505, all the leading sees of the empire were headed by Monophysites, except for Rome.²⁴³

In late 517 the events that took place in Apamea (Syria) after the replacement of the Chalcedonian bishop with another who favoured Monophysitism are worthy of recording. When the Monophysite bishop took his seat, the monks of Syria II started a mass protest. Armed men attacked the marching monks while they were still 20 km. outside Apamea, killing some 350 of their number.²⁴⁴ Thus, when Justin I ascended the throne following Anastasios' death in July 518, religious issues needed urgent treatment. The sources depict that his coronation had taken place "with the consent of the army, senate, demes and the church".²⁴⁵ With Justin, the religious policy followed since the latter part of the reign of Anastasios changed completely. Timotheos of Alexandria, Dioskoros II of Alexandria and, of course, Severos of Antioch were all deposed from their sees and replaced by Chalcedonian patriarchs shortly after his enthronement. It is in this context that we have to see the letter to the *synodos endemousa* by all the monasteries of Constantinople sent in the name of "the whole monastic order".²⁴⁶ Theophilos of Herakleia presided over the synod, which was gathered in the absence of the patriarch of Constantinople, John II. In the petition, the monks request anathema on Severos of Antioch and reinstatement of the names of Makedonios and Euphemios, patriarchs of Constantinople deposed by Anastasios, as well as the councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, in the diptychs.²⁴⁷ The petition followed that of "the people of Constantinople" addressed to the patriarch, "shouted" during a mass demonstration that took place on the 15th of July, five days before the petition of the monks. Both made the same demands.²⁴⁸ In fact, the latter refers to the *libellos* sent by the people, claiming to "represent all the monasteries as of one voice and to agree to what the Christ-loving people of the city had recently addressed to John, Patriarch of the Great Church".²⁴⁹ Hegoumenoi (or *deuteraioi*) of fifty-four monasteries signed the petition. Monasteries inside the city, at Chalcedon and at Sykai are not given under a separate heading, so it includes *all*

²⁴³ John of Nikiu, p. 125. See the section where a certain monk Ammonius from Alexandria foresees the enthronement of Anastasios: "I have seen the hand of God upon thee...and he has chosen thee from among many thousands to be anointed: for it is written 'the hand of the Lord is on the head of the kings.' do no sin of any kind and transgress not against the Christian faith which had provoked God to anger." p. 122.

²⁴⁴ Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 288.

²⁴⁵ A.A. Vasiliev, *Justin I. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), pp. 75-76.

²⁴⁶ ACO III, pp. 67-71. A short commentary can be found in Vasiliev, *Justin I*, pp. 145-148.

²⁴⁷ ACO III, p. 67.

²⁴⁸ Bacht, "Die Rolle", pp. 289-290.

²⁴⁹ ACO III, p. 67 lines 15-20. Referring to 15 July. Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 290.

monasteries inside the city as well as those in its vicinity. Here is the list, headed by the hegoumenoi of the monasteries of Dalmatios, Dios, Thalassios and Akoimetoï:

1. Alexander of the monastery of Dalmatios "of holy memory and *exarch* of the holy monasteries".
2. Konstas of the monastery of Dios "of holy memory".
3. Diogenes of the monastery of Thalassios "of holy memory, also known as the Unshod, signed through the hand of Christos the *anagnostes*, because old age prevails over me [and] I cannot sign everything by myself."
4. Euethios of the monastery of the Akoimetoï.
5. John "presbyter of the holiest Great Church and hegoumenos of the monastery of St Eusebios".
6. Antony of the monastery of Abramios.
7. Akakios of the monastery of Kyriakos.
8. Domnos of the monastery "of Job of holy memory... I signed through the hand of Gymnasios, my monk and *apokrisarios*, because I am old and sick and cannot sign everything by myself."
9. John of the monastery "of Manouelios of holy memory...signed the petitions through the hand of Tryphon, my presbyter, because I am old and cannot sign everything".
10. Leontios of the monastery of St Tryphon "of holy memory".
11. John of the monastery "called Konsta... I signed the petition through the hand of Sergios, my deacon and *apokrisarios*, because I am unlettered".
12. Polychronios of the monastery in Aithrios.
13. Sophronios of the monastery "called in Kalamos."
14. Anatolios of the monastery of Asterios.
15. Martyrios of the monastery of Basianos "of holy memory...signed the petition through the hand of Joseph, the deacon and monk of the same monastery, because I am old and cannot sign everything".²⁵⁰
16. Kyriakos of the monastery called the Syrians.
17. Julian of the monastery of St Phokas "signed the petition through the hand of Demetrios my deacon...because I am unlettered".
18. Jacob of the monastery of the Romans in Petriou.
19. Christinos of the monastery of St Theodore "signed the petition through the hand of Theodore my monk, because my hands are not well".
20. John of the monastery of St John of Stoudios "signed the petition through the hand of Theodore, *anagnostes*/reader and monk, because I am old and sick".
21. Basiliskos of the monastery of St Euphemia in Olybrios "signed the petition through the hand of Andronikos the presbyter, because I am old and am quivering".
22. Babylas of the monastery of St Daniel the Stylite.
23. Hypatios of the monastery of Olympias.
24. Markos hegoumenos "of the monastery called Jerusalem".

²⁵⁰ Mentioned in the *vita* of St. Matrona of Perge (ca. 430-510/515). The *Synaxarion* claims that the monastery "flourished" under Marcian. In the *vita*, St Bassianos is hegoumenos when Matrona enters his monastery disguised as a monk. See "Life of St Matrona of Perge", trans. J. Featherstone and C. Mango, in *Holy Women of Byzantium. Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. A.-M. Talbot (Washington, D.C., 1996), p. 23. See also the references to Verina, wife of Leo I; Euphemia, wife of Antimus, emperor of the West (467-472); and Antiochiane, wife of Sporacius, consul in 452, in *ibid.*, pp. 48-51. Antiochiane gave her a lodging of which Matrona had full ownership. The *vita* also refers to Akakios, hegoumenos of the monastery of Abramios at Triton. Bassianou was at Deuteron and Matrona's own monastery at Severiana in a rose garden. *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 51. See also Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 60-61.

25. Kyriakos of the monastery of Anastasios "near the aqueduct".
26. Sophronios of the monastery of Theodore the Egyptian.²⁵¹
27. Elias of the monastery of St Euphemios.
28. Raboulas of the monastery called Elias of holy memory "I signed through the hand of Thomas the deacon, because I do not know Greek."
29. Andreas of the monastery called Kyriakos "of holy memory".
30. Ariston of the monastery "called John, I signed the petition through the hand of Akakios the deacon, because I am unlettered".
31. Zosimos of the monastery of Maximinos.
32. John of the monastery of Kyros near St Romanos in Hellebichos.
33. Timotheos.
34. Zolios of the monastery of Theodotos.
35. Dorotheos of the monastery of Theodore "I signed through the hand of Petros the deacon, because I am reclining".
36. Zotikos.
37. Pantoleon of the monastery called Venantios.
38. Hypatios of the monastery of Charisios "I signed the petition through the hand of Eleutherios the deacon, because I am unlettered".
39. Eugenios of the monastery of St George in Xerokerkos "I signed the petition through the hand of Eleutherios the deacon, because I am unlettered".
40. Eutychios of the monastery of the Lykanonians near St Laurence.
41. Alexander.
42. Symeon of the monastery of Kaiouma.
43. Eleutherios of the monastery of Paulinios.
44. Ambrosios of the monastery of St Maria in Lithostrotos.
45. Sabas of the monastery of St Thomas near the cistern "I signed the petition through Aoulsabos the presbyter, because I am unlettered".
46. Paul of the monastery of Lykanonians "I signed the petition through the hand of Julian the *anagnostes*/reader, because I was detained by sickness and could not sign".
47. Viventios of the monastery "called 'of the Romans', I signed the petition through the hand of Stephen, monk of the same monastery, because I am unlettered".
48. Alexander of the monastery of Kyklopion "I signed the petition through the hand of Phokas, monk and *apokrisarios*, because my hands hurt and it is not possible for me to sign".
49. Jordanes of the monastery of St Maria close to St Loukas.
50. Zenobios of the monastery Maronios in Sykai.
51. Anatolios of the monastery of Philippos.
52. Jacob of the monastery of St Maria near Boukoleion.
53. Elias of the monastery of Samuel "of holy memory which is in Sykai I signed through the hand of monk Kosmas, because I am unlettered".
54. Leontios of the monastery of St Michael, the Archangel, "in the region of Pouseos".

The petition and the riots in Constantinople were taken into serious consideration at the court. We know that it was after the *libelloi* of the people and of the monks of Constantinople that the greatest rival Monophysite bishop Severos was actually deposed and replaced by his Chalcedonian counterpart. Thus, the monks and the *vox populi* were accorded

²⁵¹ Another reference to the monastery is in the *vita* of St Patapios: see E. Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος και η Κοινωνία των Σκοτεινών Αιώνων* (Athens, 1996), p. 52.

what they had asked for. Immediately after this *synodos* another Chalcedonian synod took place in Jerusalem in August. Regardless of what these events meant for the religious policy in the whole empire, for Constantinople this surely meant amendment of the relations with Rome.²⁵² In terms of religious policy concerning the Monophysites, the reign of Justin (and Justinian I, officially, after 527) is divided into three phases. In the first, extending between 518-520, severe measures were implemented against Monophysites, so harsh that in the Near East they were persecuted everywhere. Many of them had to escape to Egypt, which remained relatively untouched by the persecutors. After a milder phase from 520 to 527, the persecutions started once again with the edict "against the heretics", i.e. the Monophysites. The see of Antioch, home of the Monophysites, especially of their leader Severos, was the worst affected by the second upsurge of Monophysite persecution, since no overtly Monophysite bishop was allowed to hold this see.²⁵³ For the same reason, throughout most of the period, it remained occupied by Ephrem, a strict follower of the Chalcedonian Creed. The situation was not different in the rest of the major sees; in all four leading sees of the east, only orthodox bishops were allowed to function.

During the first five years of Justinian's reign, Epiphanius was patriarch of Constantinople. At his accession in 520, he had sent a confession of faith to Pope Hormisdas assuring that he had agreed to the tome of Leo, the core of the Chalcedonian Creed. At the court, Justinian was personally interested in religious issues and definition of the dogma. He kept contact with the Pope, as evident from the letters he sent to the apostolic see.²⁵⁴ In 531/532 he summoned all the expelled bishops and banished monks to Constantinople. This gathering was planned to try to dissolve the differences between the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites, a very difficult task. Severos of Antioch, for one, declined the invitation. Meanwhile, in January 532, during the Nika riot, the main basilica of the capital was demolished. Justinian immediately gave orders for the construction of the domed church, which was to change and dominate both the architectural and the liturgical meaning of Christian assembly, the *ekklesia*, for centuries to come.²⁵⁵ In the winter of 534-535, the Monophysite influences at the court became more pronounced, particularly under the protection of empress Theodora, the "Christ-worshipping queen" of the Monophysites. Severos' return to Constantinople and the appointment of Anthimos (June 535- March 536), "an ascetic man and a practiser of poverty, and a friend of the needy...[who] would not receive

²⁵² Bacht, "Die Rolle", p. 291.

²⁵³ For the periodisation, see Vasiliev, *Justin I.* pp. 222-228.

²⁵⁴ Grumel, *Les registres*, pp. 158-163.

the council of Chalcedon to the faith", to the city's patriarchate made this a strong proposition.²⁵⁶ However, reaction to the appointment followed shortly after with a flow of Chalcedonians to the city that was to change the course of events in Constantinople, which had so far evolved in favour of the Monophysites. In March 536, shortly after Pope Agapetus' arrival, both Anthimos and Severos were expelled from the city.²⁵⁷ Menas was appointed to the patriarchate in Constantinople, a position which he would continue to hold until 552.

Shortly afterwards, a home synod convened at the church of St Maria (Theotokos, Chalkoprateia), near St Sophia, in May 536, presided over by Menas. The meetings dragged on until 4 June 536, when the final decision was made.²⁵⁸ The monks of Constantinople were present at the sessions on the 2nd, 6th, 10th, 21st of May. The *libellos* they had previously sent to Pope Agapetus was read on 2 May in the presence of bishops and the signatory monks. The other two *libelloi* addressed to patriarch Menas and emperor Justinian were read at the session on June 4, 536.

The session on May 2, concerning the trial and excommunication of the ex-patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimos, started with the reading of the *libellos* of the monks to Pope Agapetus, in the presence of 87 monks from Constantinople, Syria and Palestine.²⁵⁹ The petition was from Marianos of Dalmatios, exarch of the archimandrites of Constantinople, and from the archimandrites and monks of Jerusalem and the East.²⁶⁰ The monks blamed the *Akephaloi*, i.e., the Monophysites, for daring to perform their heretical teaching in all churches, including those of Constantinople, "for some monks who share the same lawless beliefs dwell in certain houses that are pious only in appearance. These monks have blinded the true belief of our God-loving emperor with the heresy they have derived from their father the devil who, having failed to entrench [in community] displays himself by the creation of heresy".²⁶¹ The heretics of one were the orthodox saints of another. It is highly likely that the petition refers to the same group of monks mentioned in *The Lives of the Eastern Saints*. Its author, John, Monophysite bishop of Ephesus, refers to a number of Monophysite monks who had been in Constantinople since the beginning of the persecution under Justin. Stephen, for

²⁵⁵ On this, see R. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, Minn., 1992), p. 29.

²⁵⁶ Zachariah of Mitylene, p. 265. Anthimos was originally from Trebizond.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 299.

²⁵⁸ There were five sessions, four in May and one in June. The ones in May took place on the 2nd, 6th, 10th and 21st and are respectively on pp. 126, 154, 161, 169 of *ACO* III. The session on June 4, 536 is in *ACO* III, pp. 27ff. The letters of the monks, bishops, et al., and all the relevant material from 518 and 519 were gathered and read at this session. The subscriptions to the final decisions are on pp. 113-119. The list contains only the names of the bishops. Zachariah of Mitylene is not among the subscribers.

²⁵⁹ *ACO* III, pp. 128-130.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 137, lines 16-19.

example, the notary of Mare, bishop of Amida, was invited to come up to the capital on order of the empress Theodora, who had become "queen" in 527.²⁶² In Theodora, all the Monophysites seem to have found a powerful, zealous protectress who "had been gathering together persecuted men from all quarters and looking after them, in that they had been placed by her in the palace called Hormisdas...".²⁶³ Among these persecuted ones, of great interest is Zoura (Zooras of the petitions), a monk from Syria, who at the time of the council was living at Sykai²⁶⁴ in a villa which Kallinikos, one of the Monophysite *cubicularii* of the court, had provided him.²⁶⁵ Zoura was invited to Constantinople by Theodora during the persecutions in the east, as was Theodosios, ex-Patriarch of Alexandria, who stayed there between 535 and 537. The city seems to have been a safe haven for the persecuted bishops and monks. In fact, John of Ephesus, who was going back and forth between Constantinople, Egypt and Antioch, writes that not only various houses in the city,²⁶⁶ but even the imperial palace were teeming with Monophysites who had come to the city from all quarters of the empire:

"...blessed men gather together in the royal city by the believing queen at the time of the persecution, out of many peoples and various local tongues...it was indeed composed of many men who did not fall short of the number of five hundred...by great and distinguished heads of the convents from all quarters of the east and the west, and Syria and Armenia and Cappadocia and Cilicia and Isauria and Lycaonia and Asia and Alexandria and Byzantium, while one might consequently go into the palace itself called that of Hormisdas, as into a great and marvellous desert of solitaires, and marvel at their numbers..."²⁶⁷

In the petition the monks name Anthimos, Severos, Petros and Zoura as leaders of the heretical sect that has invaded the private houses,²⁶⁸ *proasteia* outside the city, imperial houses, churches and baptisteries and ask for the Pope's help to convince the emperor so that he may eventually agree to "drag the Monophysites outside the city and the churches of the

²⁶² John of Ephesus. *PO* 17, p. 207.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, *PO* 18, p. 600 See also pp. 633-634 for Mare the Solitary, who left the city and went over to Pera/Sykai, "climbed the mountain to the north west of it, where there are also graves, and there he resided and performed the labour of his practices, satisfying his needs with wild herbs." This shows there still were solitaires around the city whose numbers might have increased with Monophysite inflow.

²⁶⁴ I think this is a mistake on John's part. Elsewhere, he refers to his exile to Derkos. Presumably, Zoura was not in Sykai, too close to the city, but in Derkos at the time of the council.

²⁶⁵ John of Ephesus. *PO* 17, Introduction p. vii.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, *PO* 18, p. 583 where he refers to the private chapels which were used in secrecy by the Monophysites who were then in Constantinople.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, *PO* 18, p. 677.

²⁶⁸ Again, John refers to Theodore, a *castrensis* who lived in the palace. He was a student of a certain Mishael (also a eunuch), the same person referred to in the letters of Severos and an acquaintance of Zachariah of Mitylene. Mishael lived in Constantinople in a villa called Sema. John of Ephesus, *PO* 19, p. 205; Severos, *The Letters*, pp. 195-196; *PLRE* II, pp. 763-764. Sidéris, *Eunuques et pouvoir à Byzance*, p. 425 states that many of the *cubicularii* under Justinian were Monophysites. For Celer, again referred to in the letters, see *PLRE* II, pp. 275-278; Severos, *The Letters*, p. 73.

empire".²⁶⁹ We know that the pope had come to the city for that purpose, and the gathering of the council during which the *libellos* was read is enough evidence that he had succeeded in enlisting Justinian in their cause.²⁷⁰ Zoura is blamed in particular for having baptised the children of the houses next to the *despotikos oikos*.²⁷¹ The synod relays an order to Anthimos to attend the session on the 6th of May when Bosphorios, who had been sent to relay the order, reports that he had been to four different places inside the city in search of Anthimos: first, the church of St Michael in the palace,²⁷² second, the church of the Holy Apostles in the palace of Hormisdas,²⁷³ third, a certain *mitaton*, where "he was formerly residing", and finally the *proasteion* of Anthimos, which was not far from the church of St Laurence.²⁷⁴

Between May 10 and 21, more officials, John, Peter, Thalassios (Bishop of Berytos), Domnos (Bishop of Maximianoupolis) and Andreas make excursions inside the city in search of Anthimos.²⁷⁵ They search for him at the churches of St Sergios the martyr in Hormisdas and St Laurence, at the monastery of Theodore,²⁷⁶ at Anthimos' own *proasteion* near Theodore' monastery, not far from the churches of St Laurence and the *prophetion* of St Esavos, and at the *proasteion* of Peter of Apamea in the vicinity of the church of St Thyrsos.²⁷⁷ In the end however, they fail to find Anthimos and so ends the inquiry.²⁷⁸

The longest, hence the most detailed petitions are addressed to Patriarch Menas and to Pope Agapetus. One hundred and thirty nine monks signed the petition to Menas, and ninety

²⁶⁹ ACO III, p. 138. They forgot to add the *xenodocheia*. Isaac, from the city of Dara, is associated with the *xenodocheia* around the city: "And having entered the ministering office (*diakonia*) of those who bathe the sick at night and laboured with them in the labour of service of the house of God, he began to be known and honoured by many." John of Ephesus, *PO* 18, pp. 669-670. See also *PO* 19, pp. 161-163, where John refers to Monophysite refugees who were kept in a *xenodocheion* which Theodora built for them in Chios.

²⁷⁰ ACO III, pp. 132-136, the opening session of the synod on 2 May, where the same points in the *libelloi* are repeated: a. The Monophysites are polluting the holy sites in the city and in the *proasteia*; b. They are converting the people of the city into Monophysitism and are successful in doing that because it is very difficult for us Chalcedonians to re-convert those people; c. we are under the siege of the heretics: Anthimos especially has usurped the throne uncanonically; d. although he is deposed. Anthimos continues in his evil deeds.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 139. The Monophysites were blamed for re-baptising ex-Chalcedonians; however, Severos refused the attribution, clearly stating that there was no need for re-baptism. See Severos, *The Letters*, pp. 284-297.

²⁷² Severos, *The Letters*, p. 159. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 344.

²⁷³ This has to be the church dedicated to the Apostles Peter and Paul, as part of the imperial complex at Hormisdas, which was united with the Palace proper in ca. 532. See Procopius, *The Buildings*, trans. H.B. Dewing, vol. 7 (London, 1971), p. 45.

²⁷⁴ ACO III, p. 159, lines 20-28. The church was inside the walls but still referred to as *proasteion*, possibly because it was located in a less populated area, as the area outside the Constantinian walls still were in this period.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-176.

²⁷⁶ In the list below number 55. In the *libellos* to Pope Agapetus no. 66, the same monastery is identified as the "πλησίον τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Λαυρεντίου" ACO III, p. 145. Note, however, that his name does not appear among the list of monks who were present during this session. See *ibid.*, pp. 163-165.

²⁷⁷ Could the Peter in the letters be Peter of Apamea and not Peter Mongus? Peter of Apamea was a Monophysite bishop who had exchanged a number of letters with Severos. See Severos, *The Letters*, pp. 37, 71. John of Ephesus might be right in writing that the city was a safe haven for the Monophysites.

²⁷⁸ ACO III, pp. 174-176. The officials report that they had been spying on the same places since the 8th of May.

six monks signed the petitions to Justinian and Agapetus. The difference is because only in the petition to Menas do the monks of Chalcedon, forty archimandrites in all, feature. Of the remaining three monasteries, two are Constantinopolitan: Apostles Peter and Paul (missing in the petition to Justinian), St George (missing from both) and one non-Constantinopolitan monastery. For this reason, the most complete among the three seems to be the list of signatures appended to the petition addressed to Menas. The *libellos* to Justinian is mainly a summary of the other two petitions. In all three petitions Marianos of Dalmatios signs as the *exarchos* of the monasteries of Constantinople, alongside the leaders of the monks and monasteries near Jerusalem, Syria II, Mount Sinai and Palestine III.²⁷⁹ In the *libellos* addressed to Menas the monks request excommunications of Anthimos, ex-Patriarch of Constantinople, Peter Mongos, ex-Patriarch of Alexandria (482-490), Severos, ex-Patriarch of Antioch (512-518)²⁸⁰ and the monk Zoura.²⁸¹ Severos and Peter are blamed for corrupting the church and rejecting the council of Chalcedon and are put on a par with Nestorios, Eutychios, Dioskoros "and other heretics".²⁸² The monks also refer to the powerful position of the Monophysites in the East and in Constantinople, blaming them for having "besieged" the city with their evil teachings.²⁸³ The petition then refers to the crimes and riots in the East, particularly in Antioch, Apamea and Jerusalem, concluding again with the request for their excommunication.²⁸⁴ The signatories are Marianos, "presbyter and archimandrite of St Dalmatios and *exarchos* of holy monasteries of the imperial city", followed by:

2. Agapetos of the monastery of Dios
3. Agapios of the monastery of Thalassios "of holy memory"
4. Alexander of the monastery of St Abramios
5. Theodore of the monastery of Job
6. Eleutherios of the monastery of *martyrion* of St Kyriakos
7. Stephen of the monastery of Olympias
8. Kyriakos of the monastery of the Syrians
9. Theodore of the monastery of Tryphonos
10. Stephen of the monastery Konsta
11. Paul of the monastery of the Romans
12. Julian of the monastery of the Romans
13. John of the monastery of St Thomas the Apostle
14. Kosmas of the monastery of St John the Prodromos and the Baptist
15. Dioskoros of the monastery of Olybrius

²⁷⁹ This is what the *libellos* says; however, the list includes representatives of the monks of Palestine I and II as well. *ACO* III, p. 38 lines 22-25. See the list below.

²⁸⁰ Deposed in 518 but obviously not yet anathematised. He was in Constantinople shortly before the synod.

²⁸¹ Presumably this is the same person referred to in John of Ephesus and in letters of Severos: a Monophysite monk from Syria, a favorite of Theodora's.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43, lines 1-5.

²⁸³ For the "evil deeds" of Zoura and Severos in Constantinople, see *ibid.*, p. 43, lines 10-37.

²⁸⁴ For the full text, see *ibid.*, pp. 38-44.

16. Demetrios of the monastery of Phokas
17. Kyriakos of the monastery of Euphemios
18. Alexander of the monastery of Kalamios
19. John of the monastery of the honourable St Michael the Archangel (Charisiou)
20. Phokas of the monastery of Iona
21. Stephen of the monastery of Promotos
22. Dadas of the monastery of Kaioumas
23. Gennadios of the monastery of Kyriakos
24. Kyrion of the monastery of the Egyptians
25. Theodore of the monastery of Maronios
26. Dionysios of the monastery of Markos
27. John of the monastery of Theodore in Petros
28. Eleutherios of the monastery of Neonos
29. Zolios of the monastery of Theodotos
30. Timotheos of the monastery of Asterios
31. Markos of the monastery of Kyrikos
32. Andreas of the monastery of Theotokos Virgin Mary (Besson)
33. Kyriakos of the monastery of the holy martyr George in Xerokerkos
34. Paul of the monastery of Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, Sergios and Backhos the martyrs
35. Attikos of the monastery of Eukratados
36. Stratonikos of the monastery of holy martyr Dometios
37. Markos of the monastery of Theodore
38. Zosimos of the monastery of Maximinos
39. Paul of the monastery of Zenobios
40. John of the monastery of Isaac
41. Jacob of the monastery of Abbibos
42. George of the monastery of Kyros
43. Paul of the monastery of Samuel in Skythen
44. Peter of the monastery of Jerusalem
45. Marinos of the monastery of Paulinos
46. Modestos of the monastery called Lykaonos
47. Antony of the monastery of Eusebios
48. Tryphos of Manouleios
49. Theoktistos of the monastery of Theotokos and Virgin Mary
50. Zenon of the monastery in Kalos Agros of St John the Prodromos and the Baptist
51. Paul of the monastery of St Ermiona the martyr in Hellebichos
52. Silas of the monastery of Elias
53. John of the monastery of Mara near the cistern of Aetios
54. Basileios of the monastery of St Symeon called Kyrakona
55. Theodore "of the monastery founded by myself by the grace of Christ".
56. Babylas of the monastery of St Daniel the Stylite of holy memory and St John the Prodromos and the Baptist and St Andreas the Apostle
57. Polychronios of the monastery of St Michael the Archangel in Aithrios
58. Anastasios of the monastery of the Romans
59. Andreas of the monastery of the Romans
60. Rodos of the monastery of Theodore
61. Elpidios of the monastery of Basianos
62. Zosimos of the monastery of Lykaonos near St Laurence
63. Polychronios of the monastery of the Cretans
64. Joseph of the monastery of the Virgin and Theotokos Maria *tes Ouses* in Lithostratos

- 65. Zotikos of the monastery of St Andreas near the gate of Saturnios
- 66. Martyrios of the monastery of Valentos of St John the Baptist
- 67. John of the monastery near the aqueduct
- 68. Stephen of the monastery of the Romans near St George in Sykai

Chalcedon:

- 69. Sabbatios of the monastery of Hypatios
- 70. John "of the holy and great" monastery of the Akoimetoï
- 71. Kyprianos of the monastery of Hosias
- 72. John of the monastery of Hexagon
- 73. Stephen of the monastery of Orchardon
- 74. Tryphon of the monastery of Ierios
- 75. George of the monastery of Kranon
- 76. Polychronios of the monastery of Halapedon
- 77. Paul of the monastery of Pege
- 78. Severianos of the monastery of the Syrians
- 79. Eirinikos of the monastery of Zographyton
- 80. Megalemeros of the monastery of Kranidon
- 81. Markellinos of the monastery of Hag Archangel Michael of Rouphinianai
- 82. John of the monastery of Barnaba
- 83. Theodore of the monastery of Apollonios
- 84. Paul of the monastery of Galakrenon
- 85. Stephen of the monastery of the Antiocheans
- 86. Stephen of the monastery of Forty Saints
- 87. Dorotheos of the monastery of Patioros
- 88. Elpidios of the monastery of Krithinos
- 89. Eleutherios of the monastery of the Romans near Rouphinianai
- 90. Jordanes of the monastery of Petra
- 91. Markellos of the monastery of Dalmatios
- 92. Joulis of the monastery St Basses the martyr in Imerios
- 93. Isidoros of the monastery of his own monastery near St Epimachos
- 94. Eugenios of the monastery of Leukadios
- 95. Photeinos of the monastery of Platon
- 96. John of the monastery St Thomas the Apostle of Brochthon
- 97. Stephen of the monastery of Stephana
- 98. Eugenios of the monastery of Diapetron
- 99. Konon of the monastery of St Julian Brochthon
- 100. Marinos of the monastery of Andrianton
- 101. John of the monastery of Bryon under Photenios
- 102. Ardabourios of the monastery of St Theodore of Smilak [the Oaks]
- 103. Stephen of the monastery St Zacharias
- 104. John of the monastery of St Thomas "on the upper roads"
- 105. Theodore of the monastery of St Stephen of Lyda
- 106. Stephen of the monastery of Kokkios
- 107. Eusebios of the monastery of St Christophoros, the martyr Taryllios
- 108. Jacob of the monastery of Kalamios

The list continues with the signatures of twenty representatives of monks and monasteries from Jerusalem and eleven from Mt Sinai and Palestine I, II and III.²⁸⁵

What do the *libelloi* and the events at the synod signify? First, without doubt, that the monasteries in the sixth century were accorded an important position although still officially they stood between the clergy and the laity. Second, that they were much better organised; coupled with another important episcopal power (like the Pope) they could have impact on decisions taken at synods. However, they could not pronounce decisions, which was still a privilege reserved for the bishops. The list also makes clear the distinction between the monasteries in Constantinople and those in Syria and Palestine. First of all, they were almost fully organised into cenobitic communities, that is, there were no solitary monks in the city who lived in the fashion of hermits who feature among a number of signatories from Palestine and Syria. The monks in Constantinople sign only in the name of their monasteries, whereas the monks from Palestine and Syria either sign in the name of their monasteries or as solitary monks. Secondly, one should not fail to notice the absence of Alexandrian or the Egyptian monks from the lists excepting, of course, the monks from Sinai. This might signify that Egypt was continuing a different tradition, and that Rome, Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem had more in common. In the sixth century, Constantinople seems to have turned to Syria and Palestine in particular for the supply of monks. Thirdly, the number of monasteries had increased enormously since the late fourth century. This is true both for Constantinople and Palestine.²⁸⁶ From twenty-three monasteries in 448 the number rose to fifty-four in 518. If all the monasteries in Constantinople proper, Pera and Chalcedon were accurately recorded in 518, between then and 536, in only eighteen years, their number doubled again, reaching 108 in total. Concerning only Constantinopolitan monasteries, one may argue that they continued to remain attached largely to private wealth, and the *oikoi* provided by aristocratic Constantinopolitans. As is shown especially in the list of 536, they have surely entered the city: the monastery at SS Sergios and Backhos, for example, was part of the imperial palace complex after 527.

In many ways, the sixth century is attested to be a period of relative prosperity, especially when compared to the century and a half that follows. In view of the monastic life in Constantinople as well, one can easily trace signs of affluence from the increase in the

²⁸⁵ For some of these monasteries, see V. Hirschfeld, "List of the Byzantine Monasteries in the Judean Desert", in *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land. New Discoveries*, eds. G.C. Bottini, L.D. Segni, E. Alliata (Jerusalem, 1990), pp. 1-90.

²⁸⁶ See *Christian Archaeology*, esp Hirschfeld, "List" again. Prokopios also refers to monasteries in Palestine: see Prokopios, *Buildings*, pp. 355-67. One may compare his list with the above list.

sheer number of monasteries. This eventually takes us to the validity of the list itself, or rather to its possible meaning(s). So far, all three lists that we have of monasteries since 448 have been released under conditions in which heresy contended against the current orthodoxy, which in the end emerged victorious. This suggests, first of all, that one way or another the monasteries were involved in these heresies. In addition, all the lists claim to include the names of *all the orthodox monasteries*. It seems, however, that the lists are dubious, particularly in terms of the "orthodoxy" of their signatories, above all because of the controversial aura of the times when everybody claimed to be orthodox.

The list of 536 distinguishes clearly between the monasteries in the city and in Pera and the ones under the authority of the bishop of Chalcedon. It is highly likely that the list of 536 is complete, for if there were another list for the Monophysites, one would have to imagine Constantinople with a monastery at every corner. Even sixty-eight monasteries for the city proper, limited to the peninsula surrounded by walls and its *proasteia* including Pera, is a high number. For this reason, I think that not all of them were Chalcedonian monasteries. There is not enough evidence to establish this; however, there is some evidence to suggest such a proposal.

The monastery at Hormisdas near the churches of SS Peter and Paul and Sergios and Backhos offers food for thought. We know that the Monophysites whom Theodora had invited to the city were dispersed at various places in and around the city. Prominent members of this group in the capital were residing at the palace of Hormisdas. Some of them were residing in Sykai or other *proasteia* in the city's vicinity. The "precious" Monophysites, however, were usually kept close to the imperial palace at the center of the city, at the nearby palace of Hormisdas or the house of Urbicius. At times of imminent danger, they were transferred to a castle in Derkos in Thrace, a day's distance from the city on the Black Sea coast. At the palace of Hormisdas, never referred to by John of Ephesus as a monastery before the fire, after the death of Theodora, chambers were converted into cells and the kitchen into a refectory for those who wished to follow cenobitic practice. For the solitaries, on the other hand, great halls were divided by wooden structures, blankets and curtains into smaller cells. By John's description of it, the palace seems to have been converted into a refugee camp for various Monophysite groups whose total number at the capital is very difficult to estimate.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁷ "...all the quantity of cells that were in all the quarters of that palace, and besides the great community which in one chamber had as it were the organisation of one convent and one service, and an archimandrite and a steward, and servitors and a table together, and were continually governed according to the whole perfect organisation of a convent: while all the other halls besides, were full of the blessed men's cells and booths, some wood and some curtains, and some of the matting and so on..." John of Ephesus, *PO* 18, p. 678.

In 536 their leader was Zoura. Shortly before the synod, Severos and Anthimos fled the city,²⁸⁸ Zoura was at Sykai, and Theodosios of Alexandria, together with others, was taken to Derkos.²⁸⁹ In the petitions sent to Agapetus of Rome, however, the monastery of SS Sergios and Backhos near the palace of Hormisdas is represented by Paul, presbyter and hegoumenos, who occupies no. 34. If Paul was not a Monophysite signing against the Monophysites²⁹⁰, he was a Chalcedonian installed for the occasion at the head of the monastery, which had changed alliances according to the wishes of the court. By "the court" I mean Justinian in particular, for Theodora remained consistently Monophysite until her death, though it is difficult to surmise where Justinian's preference lay. What is even more interesting is the reference not only to a Monophysite monastery built at the site of the church of SS Sergios and Backhos after the fire following Theodora's death in 548, which "remains to the present time to the glory of God," but also to the presence of both the Monophysites and the Chalcedonians at the same palace, which, according to John, was the cause of the fire. Was the same monastery Monophysite before 536, Chalcedonian in 536 and once more Monophysite following 548, or did it contain both groups all that while?²⁹¹ It seems best to view all of these possibilities within the range of probability.

Apart from Theodore, who admitted to having been visited at his monastery frequently by the deposed patriarch Anthimos and who therefore might have had Monophysite tendencies, there is no evidence to suggest where the affinities of other monasteries lay. Putting all the information in the sources together, however contradictory and scarce they may be, I think that, beyond the leading monasteries of Dalmatios, Dios, Thalassios, Abramios and the Akoimetoï, one is in the dark. Some of the monasteries in the list might well be Monophysite.

The monasteries that are not included in the lists of 518 or 536, but referred to in other sources, are not of much help either. However, it is useful to have a look at them as well. In the *vita* of St Daniel, among the monks Patriarch Akakios sends to the saint is a certain Eusebios whose monastery is referred to as the one "near **Exakionion**."²⁹² As Janin has pointed out, this might be the monastery of Eusebios, that is, number 5 in 518, and 47 in

²⁸⁸ Not expelled, since Anthimos, at least, was being sought all over the city. Why would the authorities send officials after somebody whom they had expelled from the city?

²⁸⁹ John of Ephesus, *PO* 17, pp. 27-29, for Zoura and for Theodosios. However, Brooks doubts the validity of the dates given. *Ibid.*, *PO* 18, p. 529.

²⁹⁰ Unfortunately, even this is not impossible.

²⁹¹ Eventually, this does not take us any further than where Bardill has left. See J. Bardill, "The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople and the Monophysite Refugees", *DOP* 54 (2000), pp. 1-11.

²⁹² *I. Daniel*, p. 69.

536.²⁹³ If these two do not coincide, the monastery referred to in the *vita* is one foundation which the lists do not include. According to the *Patria*, the Anonymous of Banduri and Kedrenos, the monastery of **Augoustes** was founded by Euphemia, wife of Justin I, where she was interned. Apart from *De Cerimoniis*, there is no reference to this foundation after the tenth century.²⁹⁴ There are four monasteries called "the Romans"; it is difficult to identify any one of these with the monastery **ta Mikra Romaïou (Mikrolophos)** which is mentioned in the *vitae* of St Elizabeth the Wonderworker and St. Thomais of Lesbos.²⁹⁵ Again, according to the *Patria* a monastery was attached to the church built by **Bassus**, *patrikios* and praetorian prefect under Justinian.²⁹⁶ Malalas records the monks near the church of St **Konon** at Sykai across St Laurence along the Golden Horn. Malalas does not specify it as a monastery; however, Janin finds it surprising that the foundation does not appear in the lists of 518 and 536.²⁹⁷ **Chorakoudin** is recorded in the *vita* of Patriarch Eutychios (552-565 and 577-582) as the monastery where the patriarch was kept under surveillance for a short while before he was transferred to the monastery of Hosias in Chalcedon, included in the list of 536.²⁹⁸ Finally the monastery of **Chora** does not appear in the list, although, as Janin has pointed out, it might be the same monastery which is number 38 in 518 and 19 in 536, the monastery of St Michael in Charisios, near the Charisios Gate. Two modern authors also agree to the identification. Procopius however, does not mention the monastery in his *Buildings*, but Nikephoros Gregoras, famous historian of the fourteenth century, who having spent long years at Chora knew its history well, attributes the building to Justinian.²⁹⁹ Hence only these seven (two doubtful) monasteries remain outside the lists. Particularly in view of the highly doubtful nature of the information in the *Patria*, the fact that only two foundations (excluding the one from *Patria* and the doubtful ones) are not covered by the list shows the reliability of the list

²⁹³ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 112.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

²⁹⁵ According to the *vita* of St Elizabeth (sixth century), the monastery was dedicated to St George and was identified as the monastery on the little hill. See, V. Karras, "Life of St Elizabeth the Wonderworker", in *Holy Women of Byzantium*, ed. A.-M. Talbot (Washington, D.C., 1996), pp. 120, 127. Yet, in the tenth century the monastery was dedicated to the Virgin. See P. Halsall, "Life of St Thomais of Lesbos", in *Holy Women of Byzantium*, ed. A.-M. Talbot (Washington, D.C., 1996) pp. 294-295, 319.

²⁹⁶ For Bassus (4), see *PLRE* IIIA, p.178. For the monastery, see Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 61-62.

²⁹⁷ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 283-284.

²⁹⁸ *V. Eutychios*, p. 36. He was transferred because the monastery of Chorakoudin was extremely poor. The monastery of Hosias is included in the list of 536, as number 71. From Hosias the patriarch was transferred to the islands where he was kept for three weeks. He was tried once again and finally sent to Amaseia, back to the monastery whence he had come. Eutychios was the hegoumenos (*exarch*) of the monasteries in Amaseia from the 540s to August 552, when he was made Patriarch. The *vita* dates from the tenth century, and the earliest copy is by John, a monk from Stoudios. See *ibid.*, introduction p. xi.

²⁹⁹ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 531-539.

of 536 in particular. In any case, for another extensive, yet more controversial list, we will have to wait until 787.

Justin II and his wife Sophia are known to have been strict Chalcedonians as they are presented in western sources. John of Biclar wrote that Justin ordered "the creed of Constantinople", i.e. Chalcedonian Creed to be recited in all the churches. John III Scholasticus (565-577), who occupied the patriarchal throne before Eutychios' reinstatement, is depicted as a "chief villain" by John of Ephesus. The imperial couple founded the churches of Blachernai for the robe of the Virgin and Chalkoprateia for the Virgin's girdle. The image of Camuliana was brought to Constantinople in 574. The emperor sent a richly ornamented cross, still preserved in the Vatican treasury, another piece of evidence that is well in accord with the representation of the "pious" couple in Corippus' poem.³⁰⁰ Interestingly, the emperor is given a favourable description also in the Monophysite sources, particularly in the work of Michael the Syrian. In view of the accounts of both the western (hence Chalcedonian) and eastern (Monophysite) sources, Cameron concludes that Justin's religious policy was in fact "reconciliatory" particularly before the 570s.³⁰¹ What prevents us from thinking that the same was valid for Justinian's religious policy as well?

There are only two monasteries which late authors claim were built during the reign of Justin. Both the first, **Theotokos Narsou**, which is unconvincingly associated with the convent of Pege, and the second, **Katharon**, are attributed to Narses, *cubicularius* at Justin's court, by different sources.³⁰² There is indeed a seal which dates from seventh/eighth centuries of a certain Paul, "presbyter and of the monastery of Narses".³⁰³

After the sixth century, there is very little accurate information on the monasteries until the last quarter of the eighth century. The lack of information, as is well known, does not concern the monasteries only, but governs all aspects of Byzantine history at the given time period. For the period after Justin II until the accession of Justinian II, there are only four uncertain references to monasteries, all of which coincide with the reign of Emperor Maurice (582-602). The *Patria's* reference to the monastery of **Myrokeraton** seems to be

³⁰⁰ Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, p. 177; *Flavius Cresconius Corippus. In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris Libri iv.*, ed. and trans. Av. Cameron (London, 1976).

³⁰¹ Av. Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II", *The Orthodox Churches and the Christian West*, ed. D. Baker, *SCH* 13 (1976), pp. 51-67.

³⁰² For **Theotokos Narsou**, see Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 197-198. It is possibly because of the reference at Theodosios of Melitene's account Janin refers to the foundation as a monastery. For **Katharon**, see *ibid.*, p. 273. The sources in this case are Theophanes, Theodosios of Melitene, Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos. For Narses (4), see *PLRE* IIIB, pp. 930-931.

³⁰³ V. Laurent, *Le corpus de sceaux de l'Empire byzantin*, Tom. 5.2: *L' église. Première partie (cont.)* Paris, 1965, pp. 87-88.

legendary.³⁰⁴ According to the *Synaxarion*, Sopatra, daughter of Maurice was the second hegoumene of the monastery of **St Eustolia** which she had founded on the land she received from her father for Eustolia, a Roman lady, whose *synaxis* took place on November 9.³⁰⁵ Both the *Patria* and Theophanes refer to the monastery of **Metanoia**, where Phokas imprisoned either the daughters of Maurice (*Patria*) or the wife and lover of Herakleios (Theophanes).³⁰⁶ The third monastery related to the family of Maurice is **Mamas**. *Patria* records that Gordia, Maurice's sister, founded the monastery, where members of the imperial family were buried after Phokas' entry into Constantinople. There are other traditions referring to the foundation of this monastery.³⁰⁷

³⁰⁴ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 354. See also V. Ruggieri, *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582-867): Its History and Structural Elements* (Rome, 1991), p. 193.

³⁰⁵ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 118-119. Janin associates this monastery with the still-surviving church at Phanar.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 332. Theophanes refers to the monastery as *despotikon*, i.e. imperial.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 314-319.

V. Monks and Monasteries in Constantinople: From the Seventh to the Ninth Century.

There is a possibility that Maurice and his family were associated with pious acts like the foundation of monasteries by the later sources to establish contrast between him and the usurper Phokas. As we have seen so far, the court officials played an important role in the foundation of monasteries in Constantinople, yet the emperor's role *per se* in this endeavour remains open to doubt. True, Justinian founded the monastery at Mt Sinai at the border between Egypt and Palestine, and endowed it lavishly, but in Constantinople he is known above all for having built St Sophia. One should not, on the other hand, let the role of the imperial women of the early centuries in acts of piety go unnoticed. From the imperial family it was initially the sisters, wives, mothers or daughters of the emperors who were interested in establishing monasteries.³⁰⁸ For this reason, we shall not disregard the information given in the later sources (mainly from the tenth century) about foundations by imperial women. References to foundations by the female relatives of Justin I. and Maurice therefore are not necessarily spurious. In fact, they give the first latent signals of imperial interest in founding monasteries in Constantinople. Emperors, however, mainly founded churches in Constantinople, and though they may have supported the foundations of monastic establishments, until the tenth century monasteries in Constantinople did not represent imperial piety.

Patriarch Sergios crowned Heraklios in the chapel of St Stephen in the palace on 5 October 610. Heraklios was exarch of Africa and had sailed from Egypt to Constantinople to replace the much-hated Phokas. The one place Phokas was held in honour was the papal chancery in Rome because he supported the pope's position against the ecumenical claims of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. During the first years of Heraklios' reign, the empire was threatened from all sides. Constantinople itself was open to attacks from the Avars and the Slavs in the north, so Heraklios thought of moving the capital back to his original home to Carthage.³⁰⁹ Between 611 and 616 the Persians made successful incursions into the Anatolian plain and Syria which culminated in the fall of Jerusalem in 616, the same year in which they appeared before the gates of the capital in a joint attack with the Avars, which was repeated in 626.³¹⁰

³⁰⁸ See A.-M. Talbot, "Byzantine Women, Saints' Lives, and Social Welfare" in *Through the Eye of a Needle*, eds. Hanawalt and Lindberg, pp. 105-122.

³⁰⁹ J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 41-42.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.

In terms of religious disputes of the time, the scene was mostly occupied by the never-ending repercussions caused by Chalcedon. The Ecumenical Council of 553 in Constantinople had condemned Origenism, alongside the Three Chapters of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, but had not come close to solving the problem of unifying the Christian world under one Creed; on the contrary, it further deepened the differences. Earlier, the discussion had revolved around the nature of Christ; now it was his energies. Monoenergism, as it was called, was in essence a sugar-coated Monophysite argument which admitted to the Chalcedonian premise of the separate natures of Christ, adding it Monophysite colouring by claiming that the two natures operated through a single energy. One can still sense the power of the discontented Monophysites and the imperial attempt to bring the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites together once again.³¹¹ However, this second attempt as well proved in the end more dangerous than useful so that in 638 Herakleios was finally forced to issue the *Ekthesis*, forbidding the discussion of one or two energies, posting it up at the narthex of St Sophia. The new formula, called Monotheletism, argued for one will, based upon the hypostatic union of the Father and the Son. However, it was rejected by both the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites and with the Lateran Synod (649) it was condemned in the West as well. Once again, no unity was established.³¹² The discussions dragged on until 648, when Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, issued the *Typos* suspending all discussion on the energies and wills of Christ. We do not know what role the Constantinopolitan monasteries played in these debates; however, the period created one Chalcedonian saint, Maximus the Confessor. Maximus was originally from Hesfin, son of a Samaritan from Skr, according to the Syriac *vita*.³¹³ He ran away from the imperial authorities because of his stubborn opposition against Monotheletism. Due to the Persian invasion of Syria, he was compelled to pass over to Africa, where he dwelt with fellow monks in a remote monastery in the desert in Nisibis. He travelled thence to Sicily and eventually to Rome. According to the *vita*, the Lateran Council in Rome which convened under Pope Martin was due to the "evil" influence of Maximus.³¹⁴ Eventually, he arrived at Constantinople, when Constans was away from the capital fighting against the Arabs at the eastern border. He stayed "at a convent of nuns called **Plakidias** which was in the city; and through his

³¹¹ For a detailed discussion see W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 350-351; Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, p.49.

³¹² See J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (London, 1987), pp. 213-218.

³¹³ Actually, an *anti-vita*. In the Greek *vita* he is born to an aristocratic Constantinopolitan family. See *V. Maximus*, pp. 299-346.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 318ff.

wickedness he was able to lead them astray away from the truth".³¹⁵ This seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of either the author or his source, for there is no monastery in the city recorded by that name, but a quarter, which possibly derived its name from the palace.³¹⁶ Pope Martin was condemned, sentenced to death and exiled to Cherson. Maximus was likewise mutilated and exiled to the Caucasus where he died.

The Sixth Ecumenical Council was held in November 680 during the reign of Constantine IV. Its main purpose was to rescind the doctrines of Monoenergism and Monothelism and return the Christian world to unity. This meant reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople, as Popes Domnus and Agatho condemned these doctrines without referring to the Lateran Council.³¹⁷ There were monks at this council, but most of them, it seems, were at the same time officials at patriarchates and bishoprics, such as Theophanio, a presbyter and abbot from Sicily, George, presbyter and monk from the monastery of Renatus in Rome. Kononos and Stephen presbyters and monks from Rome, and Anastasios, a presbyter and monk of the charitable institutions of the patriarchate of Constantinople.³¹⁸ Monks from Rome, Constantinople and Antioch were present in the third, fifth and sixth to the ninth acts of the council. Between the tenth and the eighteenth acts, some of them were present at certain acts, others at other acts, inconsistently.³¹⁹ However, at the eighteenth and the final act where the signatures of those present at the council were set down, (that is, the palace officials, demes, military governors of the themes, the imperial guards, the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and deacons), the monks were not present.³²⁰

The Sixth Council issued no canons. This was compensated for at the Quinisext Council (692). In terms of monastic regulations, the Quinisext generally repeated the previous imperial and ecclesiastical legislation.³²¹ The major point of dispute concerned the equality of the sees of Constantinople and Rome. In the eyes of the Pope, no city could challenge Rome's precedence as the apostolic church; yet here was the capital of the emperors trying persistently to break Roman supremacy since the first council of Constantinople.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 319. According to Brooks this was an interpolation from Michael the Syrian who also confuses the interrogation of Maximus in Constantinople in 655 and the site where the interrogation took place and place where the saint resided when he sneaked into the city when the emperor was away. On this, see p. 331.

³¹⁶ Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, p. 413.

³¹⁷ Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, p. 68; Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, p. 276.

³¹⁸ *Mansi*, XI, col. 211, 212.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 224-630. The seventeenth act is the definition of the *Horos*; Anastasios from Constantinople was not present.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 641ff.

³²¹ Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, p. 286.

Overall, the first half of the seventh century was a period when the empire had to deal with enemies on all fronts, when most of the lands previously occupied by the Byzantines that were important for the empire's economy were lost. The empire was almost reduced to Asia Minor in the East, to mainland Greece, dispersed appendages in Italy in the west and part of Balkans and the Black Sea in the north. The Mediterranean was no more a Roman lake: both the scope and the resources of the empire were much more restricted.

In addition, there was no unified political will at Constantinople to deal with external problems: especially after the reign of Herakleios, the empire was constantly under the threat of civil wars. Instability brought political fragmentation, and in a society that was becoming increasingly more religious, factions were influenced by the religious affinities of their members. Monasteries in Constantinople were an integral part of this scene. We have already seen that they were major actors in religious disputes. In the seventh century this continued, but with a major shift in its tone. Until the sixth century, all the controversies we have seen in which the monasteries played a role were still indirectly related to the rise and fall of the emperors. With the seventh century, however, we have entered a period in which monasteries in Constantinople affected the future of the claimants to the throne, involving themselves in outright political issues. The use of monasteries as prisons for political outcasts or dethroned emperors was an occurrence of the seventh century. This meant, therefore, that the fortunes of monasteries were intimately related to imperial favour and political favouritism. Monks and monasteries rose and fell with the political group they supported. It goes without saying that, in this environment, the hegoumenoi of Constantinopolitan monasteries had to be extra careful in the stormy waters of the capital, among court officials and aristocrats, extending their network over to other monasteries, bishops and even to the Pope in Rome, perhaps more than had previously been the case.

After the second half of the seventh century, when we hear about the monasteries, the context is nearly always the fall or ascension of an emperor. Apart from the established monasteries of Dios, Chora, Hormisdas and Maximinos, there are two newcomers, Kallistratos and Phlorus, with Dalmatios still the leading monastery of the city. The latter was closely associated with emperors Justinian II (685-695/705-711) and Tiberios III (Apsimaros of Theophanes- 698-705). Kallistratos and Phlorus, on the other hand, were associated with the emperors Leontios (695-698) and Philippikos Bardanes (711-713), who had dethroned the former. Presumably, the hegoumenoi of the monasteries, and surely Dalmatios, were present at the coronation of Justinian II which, if true, indicates the extent of the involvement of

monasteries in political affairs.³²² The signs of change are there, but the details of how and why the monasteries ended up becoming pseudo-political instruments is difficult to ascertain. It might be related to the chaos governing the succession of the emperors during this period. After the reign of Justinian II until Leo III (717-741) none of the emperors was sure of his future, as most of them had ascended the throne through military coups. Tiberios III reigned for seven years, Justinian II (in his second reign) for six, Leontios for three, and Philippikos and Anastasios II for two. Finally, Theodosios III remained on the throne only for about two years. Under these circumstances, the rulers had to make alliances with powerful aristocrats, seeking to get the support of political factions in order to remain in power. Likewise, in Constantinople, the emperors must have tried to get the consent of the monks, being as they were the "unofficial guardians of the faith", enjoying great popular support.³²³ Throughout these decades of uncertainty, many officials ended their lives at the prisons of Kynegion; some others were dumped at the graveyard of Pelagios. For emperors, on the other hand, monasteries served as pseudo-prisons, a novel means of escape from the "political" world, signifying the loss of political potency. This loss carried a strange functional affinity to the maiming of parts of the body.³²⁴ Even though not by choice, for the first time Byzantine emperors were buried at monasteries and not at the Church of Holy Apostles, which housed two mausoleums, one built by Constantine and the other by Justinian, the traditional sites for imperial burials. It is interesting however, that despite its apparent prestige, from the Herakleian and Isaurian dynasties, only Anastasios II was buried at the imperial mausoleum. Tiberios and Leontios were buried at the island of Prote, Philippikos at the monastery of Dalmatios. Theodosios III became a monk and was buried in Ephesus, near the church of St Philip.³²⁵

Also, the iconography of coinage was altered by Justinian II, the same emperor during whose reign the Quinisext council took place. Justinian's coins had the inscription "Servus Christi" accompanying his name, with the reverse showing an icon of Christ. His successors

³²² Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κληρικός*, p. 50.

³²³ C. Mango, "Historical Introduction", in *Iconoclasm: Papers Presented at the Ninth Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, eds. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, 1977), p. 6.

³²⁴ The earliest sign of this occurrence is recorded during the reign of Herakleios, when his son-in-law Krispos was suspected of plotting against him. Being from the imperial family, it would be more appropriate to put him into a monastery and thus remove him from power, so Herakleios ordered that "his head should be shorn in the manner of a clergyman and that the bishop should recite the customary [prayers] over his tonsure." Krispos was confined in Chora. See *Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople. Short History*, ed. and trans. C. Mango (Washington D.C., 1990), pp. 39-41.

³²⁵ Grierson "Tombs and Obits" pp. 33, 52. Neither Leontios nor Tiberios nor Philippikos was from the imperial family; they were imperial officials, provincial aristocrats. Still, this does not necessitate their burial in

Bardanes and Anastasios used the same iconography. It was again during this period that the Byzantines became attached to icons.³²⁶ Apparently, this is closely related to penetration of religion into all layers of life, now becoming obvious in icons and representations of imperial power. Furthermore, for historical information on the period, we are in the hands of monks, primarily Theophanes and George "the Monk".

We do not know how many of the monasteries cited in the list of 536 actually survived into the seventh century.³²⁷ Again, we only know about the most prominent ones if and when they get involved in disputes. Apart from that, we know from Andrew of Crete, author of the *vita* of St Patapios, a monk of the same monastery who was actually buried there, that the monastery of the Egyptians was converted into a convent in the seventh century.³²⁸ The fortune of the other monasteries, however, remains largely in the dark.³²⁹

Throughout most of the seventh and the eighth centuries the city life was in decline. Monasteries were part of the city, and it is likely that they too experienced the symptoms of decline; however, we do not have specific information as to what actually took place. Presumably, the number of monks in the city declined. Some monasteries might simply have stopped functioning. In view of the legislation, which forbade the conversion of monasteries into secular buildings, at least the churches of the monastic complexes must have still functioned even if the rest remained abandoned. Signs of decline for regions outside Constantinople can be traced from the *vita* of St Philaretos of the eighth century, which does not mention a single monastery in Paphlagonia despite the fact that the region was well suited for sustenance of monastic foundations. Likewise, the *vita* of Nikephoros of Medikion refers to abandoned churches of Bithynia. In fact, the monastery of Medikion was built near one of those abandoned churches. All the sources, however partial and incomplete, indicate that from the beginning of the seventh century until Iconoclasm there was a decline in monasticism in the countryside. This is visible when one compares sixth century sources with those of seventh and eighth centuries. The decline paradigm repeats itself everywhere in the empire, in prominent provincial cities like Nicaea and Ephesus as well as in Constantinople. Presumably,

monasteries. In addition, their interment at a monastery may indicate that Leontios, Tiberios and Philippikos donned the monastic habit before their death.

³²⁶ Patriarchal seals always had images of Christ, Virgin Mary and of the saints, with the oldest ones having the icon of St John Chrysostomos. See Laurent, *Le corpus de sceaux*, vol 5, p. xx. For the change in imperial iconography, see Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, pp. 417, 428 for the increase in the use of icons.

³²⁷ K. Mackay-Ringrose, *Saints, Holy Men and Byzantine Society 726-843*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (Rutgers University, 1976), p. 62.

³²⁸ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κληρικός*, p. 52.

³²⁹ For a short but useful survey, see *ibid.*, pp. 35-54.

the same was valid for the city's monasteries.³³⁰ This, however, would change towards the end of the eighth century, during the reign of the much-hated iconoclast emperors. The ninth century in many ways was a return to the prosperity of the sixth century for the monasteries as well as for the empire at large.³³¹

After the reign of Constantine IV, the governors of the themes seem to have assumed more power, which became even more obvious during years when his son Justinian II was ruling. The wars with the Arabs once again broke out after a short respite during the 680s. The condition in the east was so serious that the residents of the regions that were hardest hit by the Arab occupation were transported to Bithynia and the Balkans. Neither his economic policies nor his relationship with the aristocracy, who were divided and chased away into distant lands, gave Justinian a favourable position in the eyes of his subjects.³³² Finally, towards the end of 695, after a revolt in the capital supported by the factions, in particular the Blues, he was dethroned by Leontios (695-698), former *strategos* of the theme of Hellas, who exiled Justinian to Cherson.

As I have mentioned above, among the monasteries in Constantinople, Dalmatios seems to have supported the ruling emperors, those of Kallistratos and Phlorus the rising aristocracy. The division may not be as simple as I present it here; however, considering Dalmatios' status as the head of Constantinopolitan monasteries as well as the status of the latter two, which were possibly recent aristocratic foundations, this does not seem improbable. In any case, Kallistratos and Phlorus were closely associated, as we learn that monks from both monasteries knew one other very well. Of these Paul, a monk from the monastery of Kallistratos and Gregory the Cappadocian, monk and abbot of the monastery of Phlorus were both "close friends" of Leontios.³³³ Likewise, before Justinian II's second and final rule was over, "a clairvoyant and heretical monk of the monastery of Kallistratos" had told Philippikos Bardanes, "you are destined for the empire". Consequently, every time a new emperor ascended the throne, Philippikos went to ask him when he would become emperor. The monk in return would console and advise Philippikos to retain patience, promising him long years of

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 39-43.

³³¹ M.Kaplan, "Les moines et leur biens fonciers à Byzance du VIII^e au Xe siècle: Acquisition, conservation et mise en valeur" *RBén* 103 (1993), p. 213; J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, "Aspects de l'architecture monastique à Byzance du 8^e au 10^e siècle", *RBén* 103 (1993), p. 197; E. Patlagean, "Sainteté et pouvoir" in *The Byzantine Saint. The University of Birmingham 14th Spring Symposium*, ed. S. Hackel (London, 1981), p. 98.

³³² "For three days Justinian encamped by the walls of Blachernai and demanded the inhabitants of the City to receive him as emperor; but they dismissed him with foul insults. However, he crept with a few men at night into the aqueduct of the City..." Nikephoros, *Short History*, p. 103.

³³³ Theophanes, p. 514, "These men had frequently visited him in prison and assured him that he would become Roman emperor. ...If you do not hesitate, your goal will soon be accomplished. Do but harken to us and follow us."

rule if he invalidated the Sixth Ecumenical Council, which Philippikos (711-713) did when he ascended the throne. This does not, however, seem to have had any impact on his tenure. Surely, in cases involving a "heretical" monk and an aristocratic emperor of Armenian descent, who convened the heretical council of 712, not all auguries were expected to come true.³³⁴ When Leontios was dethroned by Apsimar/Tiberios III, *droungarios* of the theme of Kibyraiots, his nose was slit, and he was put into the monastery of Dalmatios under the surveillance of its monks.³³⁵ Why Dalmatios and not another monastery, apart from Kallistratos or Phlorus, where, as we have seen, some of the monks were Leontios' friends? This was probably because Dalmatios collaborated with the ruling emperors. At the same time, it explains why Tiberios III trusted the hegoumenos of Dalmatios rather than that of any other Constantinopolitan monastery.

The rise in the number of monasteries outside Constantinople, particularly in Bithynia, where apparently most of the Constantinopolitan aristocrats had their possessions, was closely related to the political situation at the capital. During the second reign of Justinian, because of his hostile attitude toward the aristocracy, many of them fled the city. The monastery of Peleketis was founded in Bithynia in the first years of the eighth century, possibly during Justinian's second rule (705-711), by aristocrats he had chased from the capital.³³⁶ It is important to remember the same flow of aristocrats and monasteries outside the capital when a hostile emperor was on the throne, since it will be repeated during the Iconoclast era.³³⁷ It will also be useful to remember that the monastery of Dalmatios would lose its "exarchate" to the aristocratic leader of one of these Bithynian monasteries, Theodore, who later became the hegoumenos of Stoudios in Constantinople. Thereafter, Dalmatios was only nominally the head of Constantinopolitan monasteries.

Iconoclasm, what it meant for the Byzantines and how it progressed, has not yet been fully understood: therefore it still is open to discussion among scholars.³³⁸ For a start, it is not correct to see it as the work only of emperor Leo III since it certainly had a longer history.³³⁹ This would at least be undermining, or worse, ignoring the role of people in the ecclesiastical

³³⁴ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, p. 72.

³³⁵ Theophanes, p. 517. Nikephoros wrote that Leontios was "directed to live quietly in the monastery of Delmatos", which I interpret that he was forced to become a monk. The same was presumably valid for Philippikos. See Nikephoros, *Short History*, p. 101.

³³⁶ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, pp. 67-68.

³³⁷ C. Mango, "Les monuments de l'architecture du XI^e siècle et leur signification historique et sociale", *TM* 6 (1976), pp. 353-354.

³³⁸ See the relevant chapters in L. Brubaker and J. Haldon, eds., *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca. 680-850): The Sources* (Aldershot, 2001).

³³⁹ S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm During the Reign of Leo III with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain, 1973).

hierarchy like John of Synnada, Constantine of Nakolea and Thomas metropolitan of Klaudiopolis.³⁴⁰ Taking into consideration the writings of the contemporaries especially the *vita* of St Stephen the Younger³⁴¹, Kountoura-Galake has concluded that there were two different groups during Iconoclasm. On the one hand were emperor Leo III and Patriarch Anastasios (730-754), supported by the themes of Thrakesion, Kibyraiots, Anatolikon and later Opsikion and Armeniakon; on the other were the high clergy and the "pious" high aristocracy of Constantinople resisting against the resignation of Germanos, who was forced to enter the monastery of Chora. She argues that the high clergy and the aristocracy of the capital never fully supported Iconoclast policies of the emperor.³⁴² They simply left the capital when compelled to do so and took refuge in Bithynia or other places where they had estates. Patriarch Anastasios died in 754. His successor Constantine II (754-766) was from the clergy of the Isaurian domain from the theme of the Kibyraiots. In 766, Constantine deposed the patriarch, blaming him for plotting against the throne and for cooperating with the important *archontes*, most of whom were *strategoi*. The fact that Constantine appointed patriarchs from outside Constantinople shows that he disapproved of and mistrusted the clergy of the capital, who before Leo III in fact had monopolised the patriarchal throne. This recalls the era of Justinian II, who without any "dogmatic" excuse had attempted to change the clerical establishment at the capital.³⁴³

According to Theophanes, Constantine V (741-775) began propagating iconoclasm in 752-753.³⁴⁴ Former bishops and monks were replaced by iconoclast partisans. The iconophile authors give the impression that Constantine was against all the monks, yet this does not seem to be true, particularly in view of the fact that Constantine himself offered the patriarchal throne to a monk at the first iconoclast council in Hieria in 754. From the *vita* of St Anthousa, Kaplan deduces that Constantine actually donated some monasteries and was not particularly "ferocious" against all the monks.³⁴⁵ However, the fact is that the monks were the main producers of icons; by definition, they were heretics according to the council of 754 which argued that "the glory of Christ, the Virgin and the saints cannot be represented".³⁴⁶ In any

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 86 and Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, pp. 116-117.

³⁴¹ M.-F. Auzépy, *La vie d'Etienne le Jeune par Etienne le Diacre* (Birmingham, 1997).

³⁴² Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, pp. 106-143.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 153-156.

³⁴⁴ Theophanes, pp. 591-592.

³⁴⁵ Kaplan, "Les moines et leurs biens fonciers", p. 213. See also I. Rochow, *Kaiser Konstantin V 741-775 Materialien zu seinem Leben und Nachleben* (Berlin, 1994), pp. 51-67.

³⁴⁶ S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain, 1977), pp. 76-106 and 140-162. The iconoclasts might be referring to the secular (mostly imperial) representations when they were arguing against religious icons. We know that the emperors were

case, there is evidence in the canons of the council of 787 that some monasteries were converted into secular buildings, which is a violation of previous legislation.³⁴⁷ All iconophile saints, like Andrew Calybite, executed at the hippodrome at Mamas, St Stephen the Younger, Andrew of Crete and Paul of Kaiouma, challenged the emperor and eventually died for the cause of the icons. The most serious attack against the iconophiles was launched in the 770s by Lachanodrakon, *strategos* of the theme of Thrakesion. His secretary, Leo Koukoules, and his renegade, Leo Koutsodaktylos, undertook the confiscation of monastic properties.³⁴⁸ However, it is not possible to surmise the extent of the confiscations. It is certain, however, that we only know the argument of the iconophiles who did not refrain from exaggeration. Just as there were iconoclast saints and *vitae*, there were iconoclast monasteries not only in the second period of iconoclasm but also in the first.³⁴⁹

Constantinopolitan clergy played a prominent role in the return to iconophile dogma under Leo IV (775-780). Theophanes wrote that Leo re-appointed the clergy his father had deposed. The fact that Patriarch Paul IV (780-731) was representative (he was possibly *anagnostes* at St Sophia) of the high clergy of the capital shows that Leo IV preferred to discontinue the policies of his immediate predecessor. In the eyes of all the iconophile authors of the period, Paul was an "orthodox" patriarch.³⁵⁰ "Venerable", as Theophanes called him, Paul entered the monastery of Phlorus after his retirement from the patriarchal throne in 784.³⁵¹ It is in the same monastery that empress Irene went to see the retired patriarch and again at Phlorus that the "patricians and chief men of the Senate" heard Paul tell them that "unless an ecumenical council takes place and the error that is in your midst is corrected, you will not find salvation".³⁵² Theophanes wrote that under Constantine V the dwellings of the *koinobia* of Constantinople, "that of Dalmatios, while those named after Kallistratos, Dios and Maximinos as well as other holy inhabitations of monks and virgins he completely demolished." Is it, however, a coincidence that Dalmatios is not cited among the "demolished monasteries" neither in the history nor in the *Antihērretici* nor in the *Refutatio* of Nikephoros?³⁵³

represented not only on coinage but also in churches and public places. The divine could simply not be represented just as it could not be contained, which the name of the monastery of Chora suggests.

³⁴⁷ Especially Canon 13. See also W. Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival 780-842* (Stanford, 1988), p. 87. The same information can be traced from the *Patria*.

³⁴⁸ Gero, *Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V*, pp. 122-129.

³⁴⁹ I. Ševčenko, "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period", in *Iconoclasm*, eds. Bryer and Herrin, (Birmingham, 1977), pp. 113-131.

³⁵⁰ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, pp. 156-157.

³⁵¹ Theophanes, p. 631.

³⁵² *Ibid.* Also see Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, pp. 156-157.

³⁵³ Theophanes, p. 611. For the reference of Nikephoros see *ibid.*, p. 612; Nikephoros, *Short History*, p. 9.

V. i. The Seventh Ecumenical Council (787) and Beyond.

The acts are reliable in showing the importance of established traditions in the society. Above all, they show the importance of saints' lives. *Vitae* and miracles merge with documents selected from the acts of the previous councils placed almost on a par with the Scriptures and thus used to prove or to disprove dogmatic arguments. Hence, the Old and the New Testaments, teachings of the church fathers, the lives and the miracles of saints, that is, tradition mould into one inseparably unified whole. In the first act, selections from the Miracles of St Anastasios, SS Kosmas and Damian, the *martyrion* of St Prokopios, the *vita* of St Symeon the Stylite and the *vita* of Theodore of Sykeon, "our holy father" are read together with selections from the sermons of St John Chrysostomos, letters of Cyril of Alexandria, letters of Gregory the Great and Germanos.³⁵⁴ All arguments refer to the past and are taken out of the past. Again, during the first session in 787 Sabas of the Stoudios monastery first equates the anti-Chalcedonians with the iconoclasts. Next, he argues that the anti-Chalcedonians were heretics and were not received by the canons; *ergo*, the iconoclasts, being just as heretical as they, should not be received by the Holy Canons.³⁵⁵ Tarasios then tries to convince, at times to compel the fervent iconophile monks into accepting the repentant iconoclasts back into the church. And what evidence does Tarasios use to convince Sabas and the monks? He orders that a section from the *vita* of St Sabas to be read, before concluding that only those bishops who persisted in their heresy, as Nestorios, Eutychios and Severos had previously done, should not be reinstated to their sees.³⁵⁶

The monks are not only present at sessions of this council, but they also take part in the discussions, as the above case concerning Sabas of Stoudios exemplifies. Sabas was certainly not alone at the council; there were, altogether, 132 monks from various parts of the empire, including Constantinople, Chalcedon, the islands and Mt Sion, but primarily from Asia Minor, and particularly from Bithynia. The location of many monasteries, however, cannot be identified. There are not any monks from Syria or Palestine, as was the case for the *libelloi* of 536.

³⁵⁴ *Mansi* XIII. 8-108.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 1047.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.* For an assessment of the discussion between Tarasios and Sabas and the monks, see M.-F. Auzépy, "La place des moines à Nicée II (787)", *Byzantion* 58 (1988), pp. 12-17.

In the second Act, after all the bishops have signed the decisions of the council, a rather peculiar discussion revolves around in the room:³⁵⁷

-The Holy Synod said, "It is rightful that the reverend monks proclaim³⁵⁸ as well".

-The reverend monks said, "If this is the regulation, i.e. that the monks as well, we shall proclaim, as you have ordered".

-Tarasios, the most reverend Patriarch said, "The regulation is that each and every single person in the synod should proclaim his own consent".

-Sabas, the most reverend monk and hegoumenos of the monastery of the Stoudites said, "We are ruled according to the Faith, which is ancient and was transferred to us from the old years both by the holy Apostles and the prophets, the teachers in the catholic and apostolic Church: and we have heard the letter sent by the thrice holy and Apostolic Pope Hadrian to our pious and Christ-loving emperors³⁵⁹ and Tarasios the Ecumenical Patriarch,... In the same way I agree to and believe in and worship the holy icons. Those who do not hold the same views I anathematise".

-Grigorios the most reverend monk and hegoumenos of the monastery of St Sergios said, "We are ruled according to the laws which are ancient and from the old years which were delivered to the holy and Great Church of God by the holy and all-honorable apostles and protected by the holy and all-sacred fathers and our teachers, that is by the six holy and ecumenical councils.... With yearning of all my heart I accept and confess and believe that with this true confession of mine I will receive forgiveness for my sins...

And the other monks sign:

I John, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Pagourion, proclaim the same

I Eustathios, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Maximinos, same

I Symeon, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Chora, same

I George, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Pege, same

I Symeon, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Abramites, same

I Joseph, the pious hegoumenos of the monastery of Herakleios, same

I Platon, hegoumenos of the monastery of Sakkoudion, same

I Gregory, hegoumenos of the monastery of Hyakinthos, same

And consequently all the monks, same.

The closest we get to the events in this council took place in the trial of Eutychios. There as well the monks signed, showing that they had agreed to anathematise him; however, there they had *signed* but *not proclaimed*. Tarasios is right in saying every person in the synod should sign and thus ascertain his presence at the synod as we have seen was the case in the sessions of the council of 536. However, he is mistaken in arguing that every person present at the synod should proclaim his consent to its decisions. Before the council of 787, the monks had never proclaimed at a council: that was a privilege reserved only for the bishops. The monks did not proclaim after the bishops at the end of the seventh act when the *Horos*

³⁵⁷ Mansi XIII. 1111.

³⁵⁸ ἐκφώνησις : 1. Pronunciation 2. Expression, designation 3. Prayer said aloud 4. Promulgation of conciliar decree. See G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1987), p. 443.

³⁵⁹ Irene and Constantine.

was read,³⁶⁰ from which Auzépy concludes that the monks still occupied an inferior position with respect to the bishops, and that they did not contribute to the decisions of the church nor its internal affairs. This was simply a *geste honorifique* on Tarasios' part.³⁶¹ Still, the authorisation they were recently given to proclaim at an ecumenical council signifies a change in their perceived, if not the official status. Here is the list of signatory monks at the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787:

1. *Sabas of Stoudios*
2. *Gregory of Hormisdou*
3. *Symeon of Chora*
4. John of Pagourion
5. *Eustathios of Maximinos*
6. Joseph of Herakleios³⁶²
7. Thomas of Chenolakkos
8. Platon of Sakkoudion
9. Theodore of Pandos
10. Makaris of Bardas
11. Strategios of St Sion
12. Gregory of Hyakinthos
13. *Joseph of the Akoimetoï*
14. *Michael of St Petros*
15. Theodore of Bodos
16. Theophylaktos of Kathos
17. Constantine of Kalauron
18. *Antonios of Dios*
19. *Hilarion of Phlorus*
20. Niketas of St Alexander
21. Theodore of Xerokepos
22. Niketas of Goudila
23. *Niketas of St Elias*
24. Theoktistos of St Auletos
25. *Konstas St Kyrikos*
26. Stephen of Kareon
27. *Nikephoros St Theotokos*
28. *Theophylaktos of St Elias*
29. John of St Chenolakkos
30. Paul of Bistilos
31. Stephen of Kerykos
32. Lazaros of St Autonomos
33. *Ignatios of Sykea*
34. *Gregory of Kallistratos*
35. Gregory of Monagros
36. Sissinos of Aritas

³⁶⁰ Mansi xiii, 373ff.

³⁶¹ Auzépy, "La place des moines", p. 11.

³⁶² In Bithynia, where Bardanes Tourkos retired in 802/803. See Theophanes, p. 657.

37. Anastasios of Karneas
38. Baanes of Thermes
39. Peter of the Homerikans
40. Stephen of the Thermizons
41. Thomas of Hieragathes
42. Theophylaktos of Kathodos
43. *Nikephoros of St Andreas*
44. Constantine of St Thirsos
45. Leon of St George of the Kellia
46. John of Lakkoi
47. Leo of Leukon Hydor
48. Gregory of Agauros
49. Isidoros of Latros
50. Dositheos of Mnemoseuos
51. Nikephoros of St Sergios of Medikion
52. Theodore of Amorion
53. Theodore of Kandeles
54. Constantine of St Treis Paides
55. John of Koilades
56. Antony of Dodekathos/Dodekathronon
57. Paul of Hag Agnyoi
58. Paul of St Petroupolis pastors
59. Euxemon of Krizos
60. Makaris of Psarodos
61. Epiphanios of Paranandos
62. Antony of Peristereona
63. David of St Georgios Petiet
64. John of St Zotikos
65. Agapios of St Thyrsos
66. Daniel of St Theotokos Perizeton
67. Kallistos representing monasteries in Cyprus
68. Theophylaktos of Bordos
69. Theodore of Limbos
70. Konstas of Hippos
71. George of the Domnikans
72. Euthymos of Hozybetoi
73. Antony of Ousia
74. Basiliskos of St Andreas
75. Philippos of Beomoi
76. Basileios of St Theotokos Hortykidios
77. Akakios of St Orestos
78. John of Soter
79. Peter of Kellarion
80. Zacharias of Syndeis
81. Theophilos of St Theotokos Photnon
82. Kerykos of Dolokome
83. Sergios of the Germians
84. John of St Sergios of the Germians
85. Niketas of Hoktaon
86. Antony of Akrabor

87. Peter of Platonios
88. Markos of St John the Theologian
89. Leo of St Theotokos of the Saldalans
90. Konsta of St Stephen of Antipsilios
91. Theodore of St Theotokos Kaloketon
92. *Eutychianos of Kallistratos*
93. Theodotos of St Theotokou Epikanze
94. John of Bonison
95. Kallistos of Bonison
96. Niketas of the monastery of St Theotokos of the village of Tios
97. Samuel of Archangel Gabriel.
98. Theodosios of St Triada
99. John hegoumenos of St Theotokos
100. Theodosios of Hag, Theodore Sikoundas
101. Hilarion of St Theotokos Kellion
102. Paul of St Theotokos of Temp (*lat.* Tyrosinum)
103. Leo of St Kyriakos
104. Epiphanios of St Theotokos Limnas
105. George of St Theotokos
106. Kosmas St Theotokos Paradeisiou
107. Euchemon of Soter near Byraikos
108. Bardas of Prousias
109. Peter of St Apostles Kastroprotiou
110. Basileios of St Theotokos (Amorion)
111. Basileios of Oxypetros
112. Philippos of Eumeneia
113. Basileios of Loukianos
114. Theophylaktos of Pegadiou
115. Anthimos of Psamathos
116. Michael of St martyr Georgios
117. Christophoros of Kandelon
118. Nikolaos of Kainourgou
119. Sisinnios of Lithinos
120. Thomas of Mosenon (*lat.* Mosynesium)
121. Michael of St Theotokos of Pyrgos
122. Gregory of St Theotokos Symbolon
123. John of St Theotokos Roudon
124. Konstas of St Petros Hydendron (*lat.* Hydendrensium)
125. *Symeon of St Theotokos of Abramites*
126. Gregory of St Klementos
127. Theognes of St Apostle Timotheos of the island of Crete
128. John St martyr Theodore
129. Theodosios of St Theotokos
130. Peter of St John the Theologian of the island of Crete

In the list, Constantinopolitan monasteries are given in italics, sixteen in total if of course, the monastery of St Theotokos (27) is from Constantinople. We can add to the list more Constantinopolitan monasteries known from other sources. Monastery of **St Anina**, was

founded after the martyrdom of the saint in ca. 730, when she was translated from the graveyard of the *invalides* at Pelagios to the church of St Demetrios at the same monastery. Her relics were exhumed in 869, when she appeared to Patriarch Ignatios in a dream. Therefore, the name of the monastery might date after 869.³⁶³ The *vita* of St Philaretos, which dates from the end of the eighth century mentions a monastery dedicated to the **Theotokos** was situated possibly between the gates of St Romanos and Charisios. The *vita* is the only reference to this foundation, unless the author did not refer to some other monastery in the same region. However, the fact that he specifies the monastery as **Theotokos at the Fifth Gate**, strengthens the supposition that this is not one of the known monasteries of the region.³⁶⁴ The *vita* of St Philaretios refers to two otherwise unknown monasteries, **St George Praipositou**, where Niketas, the son of Philaretios was a monk and was buried after his death³⁶⁵, and **Krisis Rodophylon**, which Janin identifies as the monastery of St Andrew of Crete.³⁶⁶ According to the *Patria*, the wife of Leo III (717-741) founded the monastery of **Anna**, naming it after herself. The monastery is also known under the name **Spoudes**, by which it is referred in *De Cerimoniis*.³⁶⁷ The monastery of **Euphrosyne** was founded by Irene, wife of Leo IV (775-780), possibly when she was co-empress, ruling the empire with her son Constantine VI. Under Michael III (842-862) the monastery was once again prosperous and renamed Euphrosyne after Michael's sister who was a nun at the same monastery, all according to the *Patria*.³⁶⁸ Kedrenos mentions that during the second iconoclast council in 815 emperor Leo V consulted a monk who dwelt near the baths of **Dagistea**. It is not certain whether the reference is to a proper monastery.³⁶⁹ The monastery **Despoinon** was founded by the first wife of Constantine VI, Maria. Only Skoutariotes specifies the name of the monastery where the empress retired.³⁷⁰ **Isidorou/Metanoias/Theodotes**, are different names of the same *oikos* attributed initially to a certain Isidoros by the *Patria*. Under Leo III it was converted into a *xenodocheion*. After the death of Constantine VI, his second wife Theodote, donned the habit here, which suggests that it was once again converted into a convent.³⁷¹ Another convent attributed to the same period

³⁶³ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 34.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 470.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 88. The monastery is also known from a seal dating from the 11th century of its hegoumene, Anna.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 263, 332. See also Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale*, p. 46, n.166. According to Magdalino the name "*metanoia*" and the transformation of the *oikos* into a *xenodocheion* (which recalls a similar measure

mentioned in the *vita* of Stephen the Younger is **Monokoionion** which was in the vicinity of Forum Bovis where the saint's sister was nun. Apart from the *vita* there are no references to this foundation.³⁷² The *vita* of St Theodosia, victim of the iconoclast persecutions in 729, mentions that the saint's family had founded the monastery **Skoteinou Phreatos**, near the cistern of Aspar. Janin identifies it with Skoteinon Pegadion, mentioned in the *Synaxarion* entry of St Euphemia.³⁷³ The *Patria* refers to John Pikridos, a *cubicularius* under Irene (797-802), founder of the monastery **Pikridou** situated on the northern part of the Golden Horn. In the *vita* of Tarasios, the same person is referred to as *prospatharios*. The hegoumenos of Pikridos is mentioned in three letters of Theodore Stoudites during the second phase of Iconoclasm among the monasteries that resisted iconoclast policies.³⁷⁴ Likewise, the *Patria* mentions the monastery known as **Xylinitou** founded by Niketas Xylinites, *magistros* of Leo III. However, historians of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries attribute the monastery to another Niketas, *epi tes trapezes* under Basil I and *oikonomos* of the Great Church under Leo VI, which, according to Janin, are more reliable accounts for the history of this monastery.³⁷⁵ According to the *vita* of Kosmas of Maiouma, during the patriarchate of Tarasios a certain George entered the monastery of **Sparta** in Constantinople, close to the Golden Gate, taking the monastic name of Gregorios. Apart from this there exists no reference to this monastery.³⁷⁶ **Theotokos of Psychia**, was founded (or rebuilt) in the second half of the eighth century by *patrikios* Michael. It might be related to the monastery of Pege, because John Psychates, an acquaintance of Patriarch Tarasios (780-806), was previously *oikonomos* at Pege.³⁷⁷ Patriarch Tarasios himself founded a monastery on the European side of the Bosphoros. The monastery of the iconophile patriarch, called **Tarasiou**, was possibly converted into a convent sometime after the tenth century.³⁷⁸

The list invokes more questions than it answers. Not all of the monasteries referred to above are dated before the council; hence, it is acceptable that they do not appear in the list. However, it is certainly not normal that the hegoumenos of Dalmatios, or any other representative of the *exarch* of the Constantinopolitan monasteries was not present at this

undertaken by Leo VI) as well as the references in the *Patria* might imply its previous function "as a house of *porneion* for licentious aristocratic women".

³⁷² Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 351.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 455.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 403-404.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 379-380.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 470.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 242-243 and Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος*, p. 209. Also see Mackay-Ringrose, *Saints and Holy Men*, p. 102.

³⁷⁸ S. Efthymiadis, ed. and trans., *The Life of Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon* (Aldershot, 1998), p. 99 and Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 481-482.

council. One of the viable explanations seems to be that the monastery was a supporter of the iconoclast policies of the emperor.³⁷⁹ The absence of the hegoumenos of Dalmatios is one aspect of the list, that remains partially in the dark. The other aspect of the list is the way it depicts the importance of provincial monasteries with respect to Constantinopolitan foundations during Iconoclasm. This, as we have mentioned before, is largely related to the *exodos* of iconophile aristocrats outside the capital, particularly to Bithynia. The list shows the importance of the recent foundations from the capital and, likewise, the attachment of the monasteries of the capital to the imperial cause. Obviously, it was very difficult for some of the monks like the hegoumenos of Dalmatios in Constantinople to remain as defenders of the icons.

According to Stephen the Deacon, author of the *Vita* of St Stephen the Younger, under the iconoclast emperors all the pious left Constantinople and went to "orthodox" places. The parents of Stephen decided to take a ship from the port of Chalcedon and go to Mt Auxentios in Bithynia; one of his sisters was already in a monastery in Constantinople and the others were at the monastery of Trichinareas, near Auxentios.³⁸⁰ During the first period of Iconoclasm (ca. 726-787), the sources started referring to the monasteries during the period when emperor Leo III started iconoclast measures. Likewise, during the second period (815-843) we hear about monasteries in relation to the policies of their hegoumenoi. Theodore Stoudites, for example, clearly differentiates between the "fallen monasteries" and those that still defended the icons. Again, as was the case during the first phase, in the second phase the monasteries outside Constantinople were champions of the faith. This is apparent in the *vitae* of the saints who were active during the second period, many of whom were descendants of Constantinopolitan families who had entered monasteries, mainly in Bithynia. Theodore Stoudites is possibly the most prominent monk and hegoumenos of the second phase. Many of the members of his family were high-ranking officials at the financial service, including his father Photeinos. Likewise, Platon, Theodore's maternal uncle, was raised as a *ἐπίγονος* at the office of his own uncle after the death of his parents at an early age. Platon first entered the Symbola monastery in Bithynia and remained there until he founded the family monastery of Sakkoudion on the family estate.³⁸¹ Thus, at the same monastery, Theodore first became a

³⁷⁹ Possibly like Sergios and Backhos, Kallistratos and Phlorus. Note, for example, that Hypatios, a monk-horologist at the island of Oxeia was asked to choose from these three monasteries. Hypatios, however, chose the monastery of Hodegon. See C. Angelidi, "Une texte patriographique et édifiant: le 'discours narratif' sur les Hodègoi", *REB* 52 (1994), p. 145.

³⁸⁰ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κληρικός*, p. 164.

³⁸¹ See Th. Pratsch, *Theodore Stoudites (759-826)- zwischen Dogma und Pragma* (Berlin, 1997), pp.18-25 for Photeinos and *ibid.*, pp. 47-48 for Platon.

monk and succeeded his uncle as its hegoumenos in 794. The abbot of the Stoudite monastery, Sabas, was possibly related to the family, as Theodore became hegoumenos there after Sabas' death in December 798.³⁸² Considering what is known about the family, Pratsch concludes that it actually was much larger than what the sources suggest. In fact, through Theoktiste, the second wife of Constantine VI, they were related to the imperial family. Because this was the second marriage of the emperor, it caused what is known as the Moichian Schism (795-797 first phase and 806-811 second phase), which put Theodore on the route to exile to Thessaloniki for the first time in late 796,³⁸³ when his uncle Platon was in Constantinople, possibly imprisoned.³⁸⁴ The first stage on the route to Thessaloniki was the monastery of Kathara, whose hegoumenos Joseph had blessed the marriage of the imperial couple, which caused the schism between those, including Patriarch Tarasios, who considered the marriage legal for reasons of *oikonomia*, and others, led by Theodore, who argued that the marriage was not canonical. The letter which Theodore sent from the exile route gives a snapshot of the Bithynian monasteries. The affair concerning Joseph, *oikonomos* of St Sophia and hegoumenos of the Kathara monastery, is informative about the status of the monks in this period. The monks appear to be the unofficial instruments of the church, not much different from the previous centuries when monasteries were used as unofficial prisons. During the Moichian Schism, we know that nobody from the official Church, neither the patriarch nor any other bishop, consented to carry out the second marriage of the emperor. Despite Joseph's blessing the marriage using his official title as the *oikonomos* of St Sophia, the fact that the choice fell upon him was, it seems, related to his position as hegoumenos. Through the title *oikonomos* he was officially a member of the Church and thus authorised to perform a religious ceremony, yet as a monk he was safely outside the same institution to perform a ceremony of dubious nature.³⁸⁵ It is certainly not a coincidence that an *oikonomos*-monk is used in a case which required the application of *oikonomia*. Connecting all the dispersed evidence together and placing it in the context of the council of 787, where the monks were allowed to proclaim the decisions, but not the *Horos*, we can get the full picture: monks were unofficial members of the Church and were placed under its authority, respectable, yet marginal.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³⁸³ For the route he followed, see J.-C. Cheynet and B. Flusin, "Du monastère Ta Kathara à Thessalonique: Theodore Stoudite sur la route de l'exil", *RÉB* 48 (1990), pp. 193-211.

³⁸⁴ Pratsch, *Theodore Stoudites*, p. 98.

³⁸⁵ Karlin-Hayter, "A Byzantine Politician Monk", p. 220 wrote that in fact the marriage was "canonically possible." It could be celebrated (with the penance of both parties), but not imperially, by the patriarch.

The case of Joseph of Kathara exemplifies one more characteristic of the period: Iconoclasm was more than a religious debate. Like the religious debates we have seen before, it inevitably had political extensions. In this context, not all of the monasteries were on the side of the ultimate winners, i.e. the iconophiles. Joseph's case shows us that monks and monasteries were part of the same political world of shifting alliances. It is very unlucky that what we know about the monks and monasteries particularly during the second phase of Iconoclasm is mostly distilled through the pen of possibly the most consistently iconophile monk of the period: Theodore Stoudites.³⁸⁶ However incomplete the sources may be, the information in Theodore's letters speaks for itself. In his letter dating from the end of 816, to Ignatios, bishop of Miletos, he refers the monasteries of Kathara, Pikridion, Paulopetros, Agros, Delmatos (Dalmatios) and Pelekete, as still resisting, literally "standing" against, heresy, as opposed to the "fallen" monasteries, the iconoclasts.³⁸⁷ We know that he was present at the appointment of Hilarios as hegoumenos of Dalmatios in 806, when he was hegoumenos of Stoudios and still residing at the capital. This was during the patriarchate of Nikephoros (806-815), when Theodore had returned from his second exile³⁸⁸, and shortly after his brother Joseph was appointed as Bishop of Thessaloniki in 811, which show that between 811 and 815 his relation with the patriarchate and the court was relatively "peaceful". In 811, Joseph of Kathara was deposed from his position at the church, and hence we may also surmise that another hegoumenos was elected in his place, and that that hegoumenos was someone of whom Theodore had approved. This was also a period when the "Stoudite congregation", composed of iconophile monasteries in Bithynia and Constantinople directly or indirectly under Theodore's control, had wielded considerable power in and outside the capital. For example, when Patriarch Nikephoros was deposed in 815, the Stoudite monks did not refrain from protesting in the vineyard of the monastery with icons in their hands. According to the *vita* the protest had spread to the whole city upon which the emperor sent one of his officials ordering the monks to put an end to it.³⁸⁹ This was a period when Theodore's family was held in high esteem: his uncle Platon was considered eligible for the patriarchal throne.³⁹⁰ However, in April 815, during the patriarchate of Theodotos, the second

³⁸⁶ For Theodore's letters, see P. Hatlie, "Redeeming Byzantine epistolography", *BMGS* 20 (1996), pp. 237-239.

³⁸⁷ *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros, 2 vols. CFHB (Berlin, 1991) vol. I, pp. 394-395.

³⁸⁸ This was during the second phase of the Moichian schism which culminated at the synod of bishops in 809. According to the decisions of the synod, Joseph of Kathara was reinstated and Joseph of Thessaloniki was reduced to priesthood and expelled from Thessaloniki. Theodore, Plato and Joseph were imprisoned at the monastery of Sergios and Backhos. Theodore sent letters to the Pope protesting his excommunication. Pratsch, *Theodore Stoudites*, pp. 168-169; Karlin-Hayter, "A Byzantine Politician Monk", pp. 217-232.

³⁸⁹ Pratsch, *Theodore Stoudites*, pp. 229-230.

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 139

iconoclast synod convened, validating once again the decisions of the Iconoclast Council. Theodore was quite active during this period, urging for resistance against the iconoclast bishops in Constantinople, Bithynia and elsewhere and at the same time trying to secure support from the Pope. It seems, therefore, that in the absence of an iconophile hegoumenos in the capital, Theodore had taken upon himself the duty of leading the iconophile hegoumenoi as the *exarch* of Constantinopolitan monasteries.³⁹¹ Shortly afterwards, Theodore was sent on his third exile to Bithynia near Lake Apollonias, where he stayed until 819, when he was transferred to Smyrna. From Smyrna he continued to correspond with iconophile bishops, hegoumenoi and, not the least, with the Pope himself. When he was relieved in January/February 821 he returned not to Constantinople, but to Sakkoudion.³⁹² In his absence, the iconophile profile of Constantinopolitan monasteries seems to have altered. In Constantinople, apart from Dalmatios and Agros, *all the monasteries* including Dios and Chora were ruled by iconoclast hegoumenoi.³⁹³ In Stoudios, Leontios, an unfaithful student of Theodore's, was appointed as hegoumenos in 819.

All of these occurrences show how quickly the fate of the monasteries could change. The hegoumenos of Dalmatios was not present at the council in 787, yet it was ruled by an iconophile hegoumenos in 816. The opposite seems to be the case for Dios and Chora, which shifted from the iconophile position in 787 to alliance with the iconoclasts after 815. "By the grace of God, the monasteries in Bithynia are still standing," Theodore wrote; no doubt, in that stance distance from Constantinople played an important role. Likewise, it is not surprising that most of the saints from the Iconoclast period had spent some time in the region where many other rich Constantinopolitans had their *proasteia*.³⁹⁴ Thus, it was mostly these monasteries founded outside the city that functioned as a shelter for the "saved" iconophiles.³⁹⁵

After the end of Iconoclasm in 843, many of the monks in exile returned to the capital. Judging from the increase in new foundations, the "return" was certainly with a vengeance: in terms of the increase in the number of foundations, the ninth century was in many ways a return to the prosperous conditions of the sixth century. Considering the status of the monks as well as the types of the new foundations, however, the ninth century marked the beginning

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 233-234.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 258-264.

³⁹³ *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, pp. 230-231.

³⁹⁴ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κληρικός*, pp. 171-172. See also Mackay-Ringrose, *Saints and Holy Men*, pp. 102-135.

³⁹⁵ For a number of these monasteries, see C. Mango and I. Ševčenko, "Some Churches and Monasteries on the Southern Shore of the Sea of Marmara", *DOP* 27 (1973), pp. 235-277.

of a new era. Monks, who were already respectable members of the society, had become part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Foundation of monasteries, on the other hand, slowly left the individual domain and entered that of the family. Especially for the wealthy families of Constantinople, a monastery with all its charitable appendages became a novel way of legitimising wealth in the eyes of the urban population. Above all, monastic establishments had entered the imperial agenda. From the ninth century onwards, very few emperors neglected the spiritual and material benefits of being remembered as "pious founders".

Thus, we start the list of the foundations of the ninth century with the monastery of **St Triada ta Staurakiou**, which, according to *De Cerimoniis*, was founded by Theophano, the widow of Emperor Staurakios (811). The imperial couple was buried in the same monastery.³⁹⁶ The monastery of **Agathos** was founded by Patriarch Nikephoros (806-815). Although Janin thinks it was in Bithynia, the author of the *vita* of Nikephoros placed the monastery inside the capital.³⁹⁷ The *Patria* attributes to **Prokopia**, wife of Michael I (811-813), the monastery named after her, where she was forced to retire when Leo V (813-820) ascended the throne.³⁹⁸ The *vita* of St Hilarion refers to the monastery of **Phoneos**, located in Stenon on the Bosphoros, where the saint was imprisoned for a while during the reign of Leo V.³⁹⁹ According to Theophanes Continuatus, both the mother and the wife of Leo V were buried at the monastery of **Despotôn**. This was possibly a convent for the female members of the imperial families who had fallen from power.⁴⁰⁰ According to the *Patria*, the monastery of **Panteleîmonos ta Armamentareas** was founded by the Theodora, wife of Theophilos (829-842).⁴⁰¹ There are two traditions (excluding that of the *Patria*) concerning the foundation of the monastery of **Gastria**. The first places its establishment during the reign of Theophilos by the Emperor's mother-in-law, Theoktista. The second tradition attributes the foundation to Euphrosyne, daughter of Constantine V. There seems to be a relation between the two traditions, since the second one also relates that Euphrosyne retired to her monastery when Theophilos ascended the throne in 829.⁴⁰² The *vita* of St Irene the Cappadocian refers to the monastery of **Chrysobalantos**, built by *patrikios* Niketas, where the saint retired in 842.⁴⁰³ It

³⁹⁶ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 430.

³⁹⁷ Kountoura-Galake, *Ο Βυζαντινός Κληρικός*, p. 209.

³⁹⁸ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 442-443.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 497.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁴⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 52, 386-387.

⁴⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 540-541. Apart from the *vita* the only other source on the monastery, situated "near the sweet water cistern of Aspar", is the *Patria*. See J. O. Rosenqvist, *The Life of St Irene Abbess of Chrysobalanton. A Critical Edition with Introduction* (Uppsala, 1986), pp. 12-15, 92 for references to the monastery and its location in the city.

was possibly located near the cistern of Aspar. Another foundation dated to the reign of emperor Theophilos is the monastery of **Theophobia**. It is possible that it was renamed during or after the reign of Theophilos to render the monastery a prestigious stance by claiming to house the grave of a person assassinated by an iconoclast emperor.⁴⁰⁴ According to the *Synaxarion* the monastery of **Euandros** was founded around 845 by Petros, monk from Olympos, and formerly an official in the army of Nikephoros I. Euandrou, situated at Pera, housed the relics of St Lazaros, a monk persecuted under Theophilos.⁴⁰⁵ The monastery of **Manuel** was founded by the iconophile *magistros* Manuel in ca. 830. It was situated near the cistern of Aspar.⁴⁰⁶ The monastery of **Martiniake** was possibly founded during the reign of Theophilos by Martiniakos, an official at the court whom the Emperor forced to don the habit.⁴⁰⁷ The monastery of **Anthemiou (Mosele)**, was founded under Theophilos, who considered leaving the throne to his daughter Maria's husband, Alexios Mouzele. In 840, with the death of his wife and the birth of a son to Theophilos, Mousele entered the monastery he founded in the quarter of Anthemiou, close to Mangana.⁴⁰⁸ **Eikasia** founded her monastery when Theophilos, refusing her, chose to marry Theodora. The *Patria* attributes the monastery to the reigns of Theophilos and Michael III without referring to the incident with Theophilos.⁴⁰⁹

According to the *vita* of St Theodora, the three sisters of Michael III (842-867) were forced to retire to the monastery of **Karianos**, later being transferred over to the monastery of Gastria, mentioned above. It is possible that Karianos, the palace built by Theophilos, was converted into a monastery by Michael, perhaps for the occasion.⁴¹⁰ According to the chroniclers, in 843 the iconoclast patriarch John VII was enclosed at the monastery of **Kleidion** situated along the Bosphoros.⁴¹¹ The only reference to the monastery of **John (Ioannou)** is in the *vita* of St Gregory Dekapolites.⁴¹² The monastery of **Leo the Deacon** is mentioned in the *vita* of Anthony the Younger, where the saint retired and died shortly after in 865. It could be one of the monasteries mentioned in the iambic poems of Theodore Stoudites.⁴¹³ According to the *Patria* the monastery of **Damianos** was founded by the

⁴⁰⁴ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 245-246.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 320-321. See also Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale*, p. 75.

⁴⁰⁷ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 328.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 358-359 and Alkmene Stauridou-Zaphraka, "Ἡ Μονὴ Μωσσηλῆ καὶ ἡ Μονὴ τῶν Ἀνθεμίου", *Byzantina* 12 (1983), pp. 67-92.

⁴⁰⁹ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 102.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 278.

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

⁴¹² Janin does not include this foundation. See Ruggieri, *Byzantine Religious Architecture*, p. 192.

⁴¹³ Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, pp. 306-307.

parakoimomenos Damian when he donned the habit in ca. 865. The monastery was possibly situated near St Phokas on the Bosphoros.⁴¹⁴

Photios retired to the monastery of Skepe, located possibly along the Thracian Bosphoros, when Basil I (867-886) ascended the throne. A convent of the same name is mentioned in 10th century *vitae*. However, the references cannot be securely identified.⁴¹⁵ Daughters of Basil I entered the monastery of **St Euphemia in Petrion**. After the middle of the 11th century, there are references neither to the monastery nor to the church that must have belonged to it.⁴¹⁶ The *vita* of St Hilarion mentions the monastery of the **Iberians** (Georgians) founded by Basil I, possibly near Sosthenion along the Thracian side of the Bosphoros.⁴¹⁷ The monastery of **Phokas** is another foundation attributed to Basil I, by his own *vita*.⁴¹⁸ Another monastery attributed to Basil I by his *vita* is **Konstantinos (1)**, named after his deceased son Constantine. It was possibly outside the city walls.⁴¹⁹ The second monastery of **Konstantinos (2)** was founded by Theophano, first wife of Leo VI (886-912), where she was buried. It possibly had a *metochion* situated at the quarter of Arcadianae.⁴²⁰ The monastery of **Euthymios (Marianou)** was founded by Leo VI for his spiritual father, St Euthymios. According to his *vita*, the monastery was built in Psamathia, on land belonging to Leo Katakoilas, *droungarios*, and had a *metochion* (**ta Agathou**) at the Asian coast of the Bosphoros.⁴²¹ Some sources attribute the monastery of **St Lazaros** to Leo VI, while others promote Basil I as its founder. This monastery, which was reserved for the eunuchs, cherished the relics of St Lazaros, brought to Constantinople from Cyprus and the relics of St Maria Magdalen, translated from Ephesus.⁴²² The *Patria* attributes to Stylianos **Tzaoutzes**, one the fathers-in-law of Leo VI, the monastery known by his name.⁴²³ The *vita* of Evaristos contains an otherwise unknown reference to a monastery in Constantinople called **Hexaboulis**.⁴²⁴ Patriarch Photios was buried at the monastery of **Eremia** in the Lykos valley.⁴²⁵ According to his *vita* the relics of St Paul were interred at the monastery of **Kaiouma**, by Patriarch Antony

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 84. Other references are in Theophanes Continuatus, Symeon Magister and Leo the Grammarian.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 455.

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128. The monastery is also well known for its church; see *ibid.*, p. 415.

⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 256-257.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 498.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 296-297.

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117 and 326-327.

⁴²² *Ibid.*, pp. 298-300.

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, p. 486.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

Kauleas (893-901).⁴²⁶ Janin dates the foundation of the monastery dedicated to **SS Karpos and Papylos** to "before the tenth century" despite (or because of) the traditional reference in the *Patria* attributing the monastery to Constantine and Helena.⁴²⁷ The only reference to the ninth century convent of **Kloubios** is in the *vita* of St Ioannikios. The convent was possibly located at Hebdomon.⁴²⁸

From 802 to 912, monasteries were founded during the reigns of all the emperors except for those of Nikephoros (802-811) and Michael II (820-829). Even the iconoclast emperors Leo V and Theophilos seem to have been involved in foundations of new monasteries, even though their involvement was usually given in a negative light. Nikephoros was the highest-ranking official in charge of the financial affairs before he ascended the throne in 802. Michael II recognised neither the Council of Nicaea nor the Council of Hieria, although his personal convictions seem to have been opposed to the icons. It should once again be mentioned that one has to be aware of the extremely hostile attitude of the chronographers and historians towards especially the iconoclast emperors, which may not always reflect the reality.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

VI. Imperial and Ecclesiastical Legislation Concerning Monks and Monasteries.

This section will take a short glance at the imperial and ecclesiastical legislation between the fourth and the ninth centuries. This will enable us to see the wider picture by taking a closer look at the status of the monks and monasteries. First of all, the empire defined itself as a Christian one, and this had made its way into the legislation: "For we are aware that our State is sustained more by religion than by the duties and physical toil and sweat"⁴²⁹. The laws relating to the regulation of monasteries therefore have to be seen as parts of this increasingly Christian world.

It appears from the Theodosian Code that at first the reaction of the authorities to monks was hostile. The law dating from 390 states that "If any persons should be found in the profession of monks, they shall be ordered to seek out and to inhabit desert places and desolate solitudes".⁴³⁰ The date corresponds roughly to the era when monks in Egypt and Palestine were leaving their monasteries to combat paganism. It automatically indicates that the monks no longer inhabited the desert places and solitudes, i.e. places in which they should ideally reside. In any case, two years later the law was repealed.⁴³¹

On the ecclesiastical scene, the first regulations with serious implication for monastic life came with the Council of Chalcedon. The lack of canons in earlier councils is largely due to the fact that the first three councils were mainly concerned with the definition of the correct Creed, to uproot heresies, that is, Arianism at the Council of Nicaea in 325, Macedonianism in Constantinople in 381 and Nestorianism in Ephesus in 431. Therefore, by the time of the council of Chalcedon there was a gap in legislation which created a need to legislate on issues covering various aspects of the religion which had so far been left untouched. Thus, Chalcedon attempted to close the gap that had widened since the Council of Nicaea.

One should also note that the legislation was inspired by the events that took place between the fourth and the fifth centuries. The canons of Chalcedon were responding to what was going on in the ecclesiastical scene since the early fourth century. This cannot be surprising in view of the fact that legislation is usually based primarily upon experience and

⁴²⁹ CTh. 16.2.16 (361).

⁴³⁰ CTh. 16.3.1, p. 449. Contrast this with CTh 12.1.63, p. 351 dating from 370: "Certain devotees of idleness have deserted the compulsory services of the municipalities, have betaken themselves to solitudes and secret places, and under the pretext of religion have joined with bands of hermit monks (*monazantes*). We command therefore...that such persons and others of this kind who have been apprehended within Egypt shall be routed out from their hiding places by the Count of the Orient and shall be recalled to municipalities..."

therefore is responsive in nature. If, for example, a law frequently bans a certain act, this indicates that the act in question is a common occurrence: the dos and donts are almost always defined by reference to their opposites. Ironically, this is the safest evidence of the existence (or the non-existence) of their opposites.

As we have seen in the cases of Nestorios and Eutychios, in the fifth century monks had already become important actors on the political scene: they wielded great popular following in towns and cities, which the authorities had to come to terms with. The first attempt of the religious authorities, therefore, was to place the monks under the authority of the local bishop. The famous Canon 4 refers to these urban monks:

"Some people have become monks only as a pretext and they confuse the matters of the church with those of the world, going about indiscriminately in the cities and wishing to found monasteries for themselves. No one shall build or set up a monastery or chapel without the consent of the bishop of the city. The monks in each city and territory shall be subject to the bishop and they shall strive after quiet, occupying themselves only with fasting and praying, remaining permanently in the places to which they had been assigned. Nor should they concern themselves with ecclesiastical or secular affairs or take part in them; unless, indeed, they should at any time through urgent need or necessity be appointed thereto by the bishop of the city."⁴³²

Likewise, the imperial legislation of late fourth century allows bishops to ordain monks as clerics when they are in short supply of bishops,⁴³³ forbidding monks, on the other hand, to detain criminals who had been found guilty by the secular court.⁴³⁴ This seems to return to and repeat the longed-for monastic ideal, which expected the monk to be impassive toward passion, indifferent to the outside world, remaining silently within the walls of the monastery and praying incessantly. Hence, in a way, at Chalcedon the unwritten custom of the previous two centuries was written down. This, in fact, was valid more for the events of the recent past preceding the Council. Because the Council of Chalcedon was close in time to the Council of Ephesus, the trial of Eutychios and the uprising of the monks against Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, the canons seem to have been greatly influenced by recent experience. We have to remember that Eutychios gave exactly the same customary excuse, written down in Canon 4, when he refused to leave his monastery, which he likened to a grave, not unlike

⁴³¹ "We revoke such a decree of Our Clemency and we grant them free ingress into the towns." CTh 16.3.2, p. 449.

⁴³² *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, ed. and trans. under the supervision of P. Schaff and H. Wace, vol. 14 (Edinburgh, 1997), p. 270. I have partly used the translation in Gregory, *l'ox Populi*, p. 173.

⁴³³ "If perchance the bishops should suppose that they are in need of clerics, they will more properly ordain them from the number of monks. They shall not incur disfavour by holding those persons who are bound by public and private accounts but shall have those already approved." CTh 16.2.32 (398), p. 446.

Dalmatios who appalled Theodosios when he left his monastery after remaining within its walls for 48 years. Canon 23, on the other hand, might have been inspired by the events in Constantinople when Theodosios invited members of the rival groups to a second council after Ephesus during which monks stoned the opposing bishops. Constantinople was, on that occasion, literally blocked by the monks' uprising, which compelled the bishops to relocate the site of the meeting at Chalcedon. Canon 23 reads:

"It has come to the hearing of the Holy Synod that certain clergymen and monks, having no authority from their own bishop, and sometimes, indeed, while under sentence of excommunication by him, betake themselves to the imperial Constantinople, and remain there for a long time, raising disturbances and troubling the ecclesiastical state, and turning men's houses upside down. Therefore, the Holy Synod had determined that such persons be first notified by the Advocate of the most holy church of Constantinople to depart from the imperial city; and, if they shall shamelessly continue in the same practices, that they shall be expelled by the same Advocate even against their will and return to their own places."⁴³⁵

Apart from these two, the rest of the canons concern general aspects of monastic life: Canon 3 forbids monks and bishops to engage in business, unless committed by the bishop to the "care of ecclesiastical business";⁴³⁶ Canon 7 forbids monks and bishops to accept military charge or any secular position⁴³⁷; and Canon 16 bans the marriage of monks and nuns.⁴³⁸

Canon 24 concerns the possessions of the monasteries, claiming that they shall never again be turned into secular buildings; hence the rule: "once a monastery, forever a monastery".⁴³⁹ Although the canon is dated after the events recorded in the *vita* of Hypatios of the monastery of Rouphinianai, it recalls a section of the *vita* referring to the fate of the monastery after the monks had left for Egypt following the death of Rufinus. The monastery had not been turned into a secular building but was abandoned and left unoccupied until Hypatios established his own monastery there.⁴⁴⁰ Canon 24 is also related to the imperial legislation dating from 434 which legislates that clerics, monks and nuns who die intestate must leave all their wealth to the churches and monasteries they served before.⁴⁴¹ It is written in the *vita* of Markellos Akoimetos that when Pharetrios entered the monastery with his sons,

⁴³⁴ "No clerics or monks....shall be permitted to vindicate and hold by force or by any usurpation persons who have been sentenced to punishment and condemned for the enormity of their crimes." CTh 9.40.16(398) and CTh 11.30.57 to the same effect.

⁴³⁵ *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 284.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

⁴³⁹ "Monasteries which have once been consecrated with the consent of the bishop, shall remain monasteries forever, and the property belonging to them shall be preserved, and they shall never again become secular dwellings. And they who shall permit this to be done shall be liable for ecclesiastical penalties." *Ibid.*, p. 284.

⁴⁴⁰ *I. Hypatios*, p. 98.

⁴⁴¹ CTh 5.3.1, p. 107.

his wealth automatically passed to the monastery, by which Markellos was able to build the cells for the brothers together with a hostel.⁴⁴²

Overall, by the middle of the fifth century, first, monks were placed under the authority of the local bishop, and second, were not allowed to engage in either ecclesiastical or secular legal affairs unless authorised to do so. However, their wealth remained largely private. Donations and private foundations were not limited to monasteries; many churches were privately owned in the early period.⁴⁴³ St John Chrysostomos for example promoted the establishment of churches in Constantinople.⁴⁴⁴ However, it was different for monasteries. First of all, they required a substantial income to house about 10-20 monks. Therefore, although they were legally under the jurisdiction of the local bishop, financially they were dependent on their benefactors. This is the key to understanding their position between the clergy and the laity. They were neither totally part of the clergy, nor of the laity, yet partially belonged to both groups. They were primarily religious institutions functioning with private funding independent from the state, abiding by church regulations yet founded and sustained by private wealth.

The canons of the Council of Chalcedon remained the sole reference for ecclesiastical regulations until 692 because the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (553) issued no canons. Therefore, the era from the middle of the fifth century to the beginning of the seventh is covered largely by imperial legislation. Justinian is known not only for his interest in religious matters but also for legislating on both the internal regulations of religious institutions and their wealth. Justinianic legislation was the first systematic attempt of the state to give particular focus to the monasteries, despite the lack of details on the status of the founder, rules for entry into a monastery, election of the abbot, etc.⁴⁴⁵

The *Codex* divided religious institutions into three groups, comprising first, the Great Church of Constantinople, second, charitable institutions and third, monasteries, clearly distinguishing between the regulations governing each group. The Great Church was made up of the churches St Sophia, St Theodore, St Helena and St Irene.⁴⁴⁶ In addition, the Great Church benefited from 1100 workshops, exempt from the land/property tax for their

⁴⁴² I. Marcell., pp. 296-297.

⁴⁴³ J. P. Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington D.C., 1997), pp. 16-18.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁴⁴⁵ B. Granič, "Die rechtliche Stellung und Organisation der griechischen Kloster nach dem justinianischen Recht", *BZ* 29 (1929-30), pp. 9-10.

⁴⁴⁶ A. H.M. Jones, "Church Finance in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries", *JTS* 11 (1960), p. 87.

maintenance.⁴⁴⁷ It is made clear, however, that the exemption was reserved only for the Great Church; otherwise, all the goods of other churches, monasteries, orphanages and secular houses, including the imperial houses and properties of the imperial officials were subject to the land tax without an exception.⁴⁴⁸ When one considers the amount of money required for the sustenance of the buildings as well as providing for its clergy, the motive behind the exemption becomes obvious.⁴⁴⁹ Under no condition could any of the properties of the Great Church be alienated, rented or exchanged. For example, Novel 7 (535) explicitly prohibits both the patriarch and the *oikonomos* (the person in charge with financial matters) from selling or donating the immovables, fields, cultivators, slaves or the *annona* due to the Great Church.⁴⁵⁰ The legislation does not distinguish patriarchal monasteries, which possibly corresponds to the monasteries under the authority of the Great Church.⁴⁵¹ If this were the case, then, when a patriarch died after having founded a monastery, it would automatically become the property of the Great Church.

As for the monasteries in general, Justinian's legislation repeats the established legislation that all monasteries require initial episcopal authorisation. The laws also lay out the rules for donations due to monasteries, by which a quarter of the property of the donor passes to his children, if he has any, leaving the rest for the monastery.⁴⁵² Justinian also repeats the law that any property, once it has become the possession of a monastery, shall remain as such, making clear at the same time that if a monk leaves his initial monastery for another his wealth should remain with the first one.⁴⁵³ As the patriarch and his *oikonomos* are prohibited from alienating the property of the Great Church, so is the hegoumenos prohibited from selling, exchanging or renting the houses, immovables, slaves, gardens and the *annona* of monasteries. On the other hand, for monasteries, churches and charitable institutions that were in need of cash, leasing is allowed with the right to usufruct, limited to three generations.⁴⁵⁴ In addition, Novels 46 and 102 state that monasteries in the provinces and in Constantinople are allowed to alienate or lease their properties, the *annona*, or to exchange their goods as well as sell their slaves when there is a lack of liquidity hindering them from

⁴⁴⁷ Nov. 43 (537) in M. Kaplan, *Les propriétés de la couronne et de l'église dans l'empire byzantin (V^e-VI^e siècles)* (Paris, 1976), pp. 57-58.

⁴⁴⁸ Nov. 43 and Nov. 54, both dating from 537. See Kaplan, *Les propriétés*, p. 63.

⁴⁴⁹ Under Justinian, these four churches had a staff of about 520 people. A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602*, vol. II (repr. London, 1990), p. 911.

⁴⁵⁰ Kaplan, *Les propriétés*, p. 45.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁴⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

paying their debts.⁴⁵⁵ All such transactions had to be undertaken under the supervision of the bishop or metropolitan, or the Patriarch of Constantinople when monasteries in the capital were concerned.⁴⁵⁶ However, the law that prohibited the alienation of all monasteries remained valid.⁴⁵⁷ In addition, all churches monasteries and pious institutions were exempted from *extraordinaria* (compulsory public services), apart from the maintenance of roads and bridges.⁴⁵⁸

The details pertaining to the internal structuring and organisation of the monasteries are put together for the first time in the *Codex*. The hegoumenos had absolute control of all the affairs within the monastery. He was in charge of organisation and appointment of all the minor officials, was not elected, but appointed his own successor and was charged with the responsibility of informing the bishop about his choice. Apart from cases involving sales, exchange and rent of property, the local bishop was a distant figure, all the responsibility was devolved upon the hegoumenos, he was the person responsible before the authorities.⁴⁵⁹ Second in rank was the *deuteraios*, represented the hegoumenos in his absence. Usually, he succeeded the hegoumenos. The *Apokrisarios* was both the supervisor of the monks and the person in charge of the external affairs of the monastery. The convents were allowed to appoint eunuchs or old and trustworthy men as *apokrisarioi*. The *oikonomos* was the treasurer. The *xenodochos*, the person in charge of the hostel, was also mentioned in the *Novellae*.⁴⁶⁰ Apart from the officials mentioned in the legislation, Granič assumes that there were a *vestiarios* (the gatekeeper), a *kepouros* (the gardener), a *mageiros* (the cook) and a *kellarios* (the person in charge of the provisions).⁴⁶¹ Put together, we may suppose that by the sixth century the organisational and legal structuring of the monasteries was complete, which may indicate that under Justinian state intervention and control over monasteries, churches and charitable institutions also increased.⁴⁶²

From Justinian's Code until the council in Trullo (692), no extensive legislation was issued concerning churches, monasteries or the charitable institutions. Out of 102 canons, thirteen are directly related to monasteries. Apart from Canon 49, which repeats the previous

⁴⁵⁵ For the right to alienate property for monasteries in the provinces, see Novel 46. Kaplan, *Les propriétés*, p.59; for monasteries (other than the ones under the authority of the Great Church), see Novel 120. *ibid.*, p. 68. Novel 54 states the same: *ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

⁴⁵⁶ Novel 46, p. 59. For Constantinopolitan monasteries either the patriarch or his *oikonomos* had to supervise.

⁴⁵⁷ Novel 102. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁴⁵⁸ Novel 131. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁴⁵⁹ For the authority of the hegoumenos, see Granič, "Die rechtliche Stellung", pp. 19-24.

⁴⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-29.

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁴⁶² For a general review of Justinian's regulations, see Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations*, pp. 40-57; for an overview of the era after Justinian, see *ibid.*, pp. 111-115.

laws on the ban on secularisation of monasteries,⁴⁶³; most of the canons relate to ethical, disciplinary issues. Canon 34 rules against "conspiracy"⁴⁶⁴, Canon 43 expects the monks to lead a life of religious discipline and penitence.⁴⁶⁵ These, of course, have to be viewed together with Canons 24 and 42, the former prohibiting monks who dwell in cities from attending horse races,⁴⁶⁶ the latter from wearing their hair long and mixing with worldly men and women.⁴⁶⁷ In the latter case, they are threatened by expulsion from the cities and by being compelled to live in the desert, since, as the canon makes clear, it is from the desert that they derive their names. Canon 40 places ten as the age limit for entry into monasteries⁴⁶⁸, and 41 rules that novice monks should be kept under surveillance for at least three years.⁴⁶⁹ Canons 44, 45 and 46 concern convents in particular, with canon 45 decreeing that women who, "adorned in silks and garments of all kinds, and also with jewels...and thus approach the altar" should put away their wealth and embrace monastic life in humility. In the same vein, Canon 46 orders that women who have entered monasteries should not leave them but remain at all times within their walls, excluding cases of emergency, and even then, all nuns are required to ask for permission from the mother superior to leave the monastery.⁴⁷⁰ One should note first of all that all the canons except Canons 40, 42, 44 and 46 were repetitions of earlier legislation, primarily Justinian's *Codex*. The foundations of only three monasteries in Constantinople are roughly dated to the seventh century. It therefore seems that in the seventh century there was no need for new regulations on monasteries, the number of which must have remained relatively low. One should note, however, that the increase in references to rich women entering convents might reflect the growing interest of women in monastic life. All three monasteries founded in Constantinople during this period were for female members of the imperial family.

The last time we hear of imperial legislation about the monasteries is in 809, under Nikephoros I's rule. Concerning the economic policies of Nikephoros Theophanes wrote:

"[he ordered] that the *paroikoi* of charitable institutions, of the Orphanage, of hostels, homes for the aged, churches and imperial monasteries should be charged the hearth tax (*kapnikon*), counting from the first year of his usurpation [802], and that their more important estates should be transferred to the imperial demesne, whilst the rates due on them should be added to such estates and *paroikoi* as were left to the charitable foundations, with the result

⁴⁶³ *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 388.

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 381.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 386.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

⁴⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

⁴⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 384.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 386-387.

that many of them had their tax doubled whereas their dwellings and rural holdings were reduced."⁴⁷¹

First of all, it is not certain that the term *basilikoi* applies only to the monasteries in the passage. It is less likely, yet still probable that *basilikôn* applies also to the *xenodocheia*, the churches, the hostels and the *gerokomeia* as well. In any case, what exactly does he mean by the *basilika monasteria*? The term seems to include the monasteries of the Great Church and the ones founded by empresses, since, throughout the period we are concerned with imperial monasteries, were founded *for* or usually, *by* the imperial women: they did not yet publicly represent the emperor. Theophanes possibly implies that Nikephoros reinstated the land tax for the imperial monasteries, which Empress Irene had invalidated. In issuing the tax, however, Nikephoros was not creating a breach in customary practice; to the contrary, he was reinstating the tax obligations that existed before Irene's reign, which must have been the case if the legislation had continued without change from the sixth century. As we know from Novel 54 of Justinian (537), only the 1100 workshops of the Great Church were exempted from the tax; apart from these all the rest of the possessions of the Great Church as well as those of the imperial *oikoi* were subject to it.

Going back twenty two years to the canons of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, we once again see that all the legislation concerning monks and monasteries is derived from Justinian's *Codex*. Canon 12 relates that bishops and hegoumenoi are not allowed to alienate any part of their suburban estates to "secular officials who are in the neighbourhood", even if the land in question were poor and yielding no profit. The canon rules that, in such cases, the land should be sold to clergymen or husbandmen.⁴⁷² Canon 13 refers to "certain men", i.e. the iconoclasts, who have "seized bishops' palaces and monasteries". All iconoclast bishops and monks are ordered to leave the institutions in question; those who do not comply to do so, if monks, are subject to excommunication; if bishops, to deposition.⁴⁷³ The remaining canons deal with inter-monastic issues such, as prohibition on the interchange of monks (and nuns) between monasteries. In such cases, the monks are asked to return to the first institution. Under all circumstances, monks and nuns have to get the consent of their hegoumenoi, even if they wish to "visit" another monastery.⁴⁷⁴ Canon 20 prohibits the foundation of double

⁴⁷¹ Theophanes, p. 668 On an interpretation of this passage, see M. Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du I^{er} au XI^e siècle. Propriété et exploitation du sol* (Paris, 1992), pp. 298-299.

⁴⁷² *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 563.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 564.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 569.

monasteries.⁴⁷⁵ As for financial matters concerning monasteries, Canon 11 obliges all monasteries to appoint an *oikonomos*.⁴⁷⁶

It is apparent that Justinian's *Codex* and the Canons of the Council of Chalcedon set the very basic rules, which legislation of later centuries did not need to interpolate. Therefore, for the details one needs to look into the writings of the monks themselves or the *vitae*. For example, the *Codex* and the Canons refer to *oikonomos*, *deuteraios*, *apokrisarios*; however, it is from the iambic poems of Theodore Stoudites that we learn how many officials there actually were in a monastery and their position with respect to the hegoumenos. The poems also inform us that, in addition to the above mentioned officials to whom the legislation refers, there were in the monastery an *epiteretas*,⁴⁷⁷ a *kanonarches*⁴⁷⁸ organising the liturgy, a *taxiarches*,⁴⁷⁹ who made sure that the brothers behaved according to the rules, a *kellarites*,⁴⁸⁰ who was in charge of the food supply of the monastery, an *aristetarios*⁴⁸¹, who distributed the food and was also in charge of the fresh water supply, and a *skotes*,⁴⁸² shoemaker, as well. Of course, we have to note that Stoudios was one of the prosperous monasteries in Constantinople: hence one may not find a great variety of officials in all monasteries. It is not impossible, therefore, that in relatively modest foundations a person would have assumed more than one responsibility. In addition, there must have been a difference in terms of the economic activities of rural and urban monasteries. Early *vitae* show that the saints were engaged in handwork: the monasteries in Syria, Palestine and Egypt were largely self-sufficient foundations. For the monasteries in Constantinople, however, the case must have been different, though how much different we simply do not know. It is possible to surmise, on the other hand, that especially the ones *inside* the city must have had possessions outside Constantinople, as the Great Church did, but surely of relatively modest sizes. Unlike the Great Church, however, they were not exempt from the land tax and thus had to have sufficient resources both to sustain the monastery and to meet their tax liabilities. There are no documents pertaining to a single Byzantine monastery that had an inventory of its possessions until the one prepared by Attaleiates in the 11th century. Yet monasteries, especially the ones

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 562-563.

⁴⁷⁷ P. Speck, *Jamben auf Verschiedene Gegenstände* (Berlin, 1968), p. 131. *Epiteretas* kept order in the monastery; in a sense, he was the monastic police making sure that the brothers avoided illicit crimes.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 151.

in Constantinople, must have had possessions, lands or immovables in or outside the city, particularly in the provinces.⁴⁸³

Between the late fourth and sixth centuries many of the monasteries were founded on the lands donated by the aristocrats in Constantinople as we have seen in the *vitae*. The first monasteries in the city were mostly, therefore, private foundations. However, it did not take long for patriarchs to follow the same trend. Chrysostomos had become the protector of the possessions of Olympias. In fact, many patriarchs, like Gregory Nazianzos and Nestorios in the fourth century, Eutychios in the sixth, and Paul IV in the eighth, were from monastic backgrounds, that is, they were monks immediately before their appointment to the patriarchal see in Constantinople. This shows that monks were already occupying a respectable position in the ecclesiastical ladder and the way to the top was open to them, even though being consecrated as a bishop, let alone becoming the Patriarch of Constantinople, was "ideally" inappropriate because it entailed getting involved in worldly affairs. Many of the first monks in Constantinople were from the east and a number of monks in the first nine centuries became patriarchs of Constantinople; however, it is not until the end of the eighth century that the first patriarchal monasteries in the city were founded. Tarasios (780-806) was the first patriarch to found a monastery along the Bosphoros while still in office. His foundation is reflective of the aura of the period. Monks had always occupied a respectable position in the eyes of society at large; however, Iconoclasm played an important role in the full integration of the monks into society. They were allowed to pronounce at the second act of the council of 787: the emperor proposed the patriarchate to a hegoumenos, Platon, Theodore Stoudites' uncle, all of which was largely due to the role they played in the reinstatement of the worship of icons. At the same time, however, it is related to the aristocratic origins of ninth century monks. As we have seen, many of them were from wealthy Constantinopolitan families who had moved to their estates outside the capital and entered monastic life there. Theodore Stoudites is the best-known example, yet he was not the only one. Nikephoros of Medikion, likewise, was from a very wealthy family from the capital. He had entered the monastery of Herakleion in Bithynia before he founded Medikion, where he was buried by his successor

⁴⁸³ "Attaleiates: The Rule of Attaleiates for his Almshouse in Rhaidestos and for the Monastery of Christ Panoiktirmon in Constantinople", in *BMFD* vol 1, 19, pp. 326-376. From the *vita* of Michael the Synkellos. Kaplan deduces that the monastery of Chora had immovables in the provinces, where the monks from Palestine took refuge, which shows that the monasteries had possessions outside the city. It also shows that the confiscations were not as harsh as the iconophile sources suggest. See Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre*, p. 298. The monastery of Medikion in Bithynia had a metochion in Constantinople, before the death of the second hegoumenos of the monastery Niketas. See Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 367. Similarly, the monastery of Herakleion had a metochion called Panton, which is mentioned in the *vita* of Antony the Younger. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, III, p. 390.

Niketas.⁴⁸⁴ The same was valid for St John Psichaites and for St Michael of Synnada, the latter being from the monastery of Tarasios. Likewise, St Germanos' father was a *patrikios* and an important official at the court. St Theophanes' (the chronicler) father was governor of the Aegean islands; his family had close ties with Leo IV through Theophanes' wife's family. St Hilarion's father was superintendent of the grain supply.⁴⁸⁵ Thus, in the ninth century, becoming a monk and defending the cause of the icons had immensely promoted the status of the monks after the reinstatement of the worship of the icons under Irene and then under Michael II. When the choice for the patriarchate following the death of Tarasios fell upon Nikephoros, a layman who held the post of imperial secretary (*asekretis*), he was initially made a monk, then a deacon, next a presbyter and was eventually ordained as Patriarch on 12 April 806.⁴⁸⁶ Thus, the ninth century begins with a clear statement of the victory of the monks; finally, monasteries have become *officially* the first step leading to the highest clerical position in Byzantium.

⁴⁸⁴ *V. Nikeph. A.*, pp. 396-430, and *V. Nikeph. B.*, pp. 13-16.

⁴⁸⁵ Mackay-Ringrose, *Saints Holy Men*, p. 122.

⁴⁸⁶ See Nikephoros, *Short History*, introduction, pp. 1-2.

VII. Conclusion

The incursion of the monks into cities was a new phenomenon in the fourth century. The first ascetics and monks of the third and fourth centuries dwelt in caves situated usually in the mountain or the desert. For them, urban dwellings were associated with the world writ large, and the world, more particularly the inhabited world, the *oikoumene*, was the one thing that the monks had to avoid. They were devoted men of religion for whom constant prayer was the primary concern. Solitude and self-sufficiency were the basic requirements and cities were certainly not suitable places for either one of these inner qualities. However, monasteries were established in cities, primarily in Constantinople, the new imperial capital of the eastern Roman Empire, founded in 330 by Constantine, the first emperor who issued the act of toleration for the Christians.

The foundation of monasteries inside urban dwellings, and particularly in Constantinople, was related to the Christianisation of the empire and therefore has to be seen as part of the trend by which paganism slowly gave way to Christian values and ways of life. Although in Egypt foundation of the monasteries in the desert was the norm, in Byzantium, though depending on the geographical conditions of different areas, there was greater variety; here monasteries within or near urban dwellings were not an anomaly.

In Constantinople, the first monasteries were founded around the beginning of the fifth century. The earliest sources are the saints' lives, which convey generally reliable information on the relationships of the early monks with the citizens of Constantinople. *Vitae* reveal the otherwise unknown details about aspects of early monastic life in Constantinople. Most of the early monks were either originally from Syria, Palestine and Egypt, or had spent their initial monastic years in these regions. When Constantinople was founded in the fourth century, it drew a lot of members of aristocratic families from Rome and other major cities of the empire. This was part of the policy Constantine implemented to populate the city he had recently founded on the banks of the Golden Horn and the Propontis. It was in the City that monks founded their monasteries in collaboration with the wealthy members of the society. Constantinople, therefore, in a way, served as the convergence point for the eastern monks and western aristocrats. This is key to understanding the nature of early monasticism in the city. From the *vitae*, one may also deduce the general outline of this relationship: a monk comes from the east and settles in a suburb of the city. Soon he draws the attention of the inhabitants of the city and is finally given, by one of its wealthy Christian members, a house, land or money to found his monastery.

Apart from the *vitae*, we learn about the monks and monasteries in the city from the Acts of the Councils. There are four lists of monks and their hegoumenoi in the city, in its appanage in Thrace, and in Chalcedon. The first list dates from 448, the second from 518, the third from 536, and the final one we get is from 787. Although their distribution from the fifth to the end of the eighth century is not even, these give a rough idea about what changes the monasteries in the city and the monks of the empire were undergoing. At first all the documents relate to some dogmatic dispute within the church. The first case involved one of the monks of the city, Eutychios, who was blamed for Apollinarianism and eventually anathematised in Chalcedon. Both lists dating from the sixth century are actually petitions from the Chalcedonian monks of the city to emperors or patriarchs demanding excommunication of the Monophysite monks and expulsion of Monophysite bishops, who evidently wielded great power among various layers of the society at the time. Likewise, the last list of the eighth century concerns a religious dispute, this time a famous one, which had much wider repercussions in Byzantium than the previous two. Iconoclasm is presented as an open war against not only the icons but also the monks. One finds its manifesto in the council of 787, yet the list is frustrating in view of the number of Constantinopolitan monasteries. Judging from the sheer number of monks representing the imperial city, one might argue that most of the defenders of the images had left the city for Bithynia and Asia Minor, and that Constantinople was not a bastion of the iconophiles under iconoclast emperors. This shows above all that the monasteries in Constantinople were inevitably influenced and/or controlled by imperial politics. They did not always support the emperors but were involved in the disputes that inevitably concerned the court as well as the Church. Not only the court and the Church of Constantinople, but also the patriarchates of the east, Antioch, Alexandria, Edessa and of the west, primarily Rome, and the imperial officials in these centres as well, were part of the picture. Constantinopolitan monks in that respect were one important link in the network, which extended to the whole empire.

Going back to the lists and considering the situation within which they were composed, I tend to believe that the one dating from 536 was the most conclusive and accurate list of the monasteries of the capital. However, we do not get another list until the eighth century, and so the implementation of other sources for reconstructing a list of monasteries founded between the fourth and the ninth centuries becomes necessary. This, however, has its own problems and shortcomings, mainly due to the unreliability of the *Patria* and the biased attitude of the iconophile sources. The most comprehensive study on the ecclesiastical geography of the city is by R. Janin, *La géographie*. The groundwork thus is

covered by Janin, and his shortcomings, which are not too many considering the scope of his work, might occasionally be compensated by A. Berger's *Untersuchungen*. Ultimately, therefore, anyone studying Constantinopolitan monasteries between the fourth and the ninth centuries has to use the acts on the one hand and the *vitae* on the other, drawing conclusions from both but always taking the information they provide with a pinch of salt.

The first monks in Constantinople were from the east, yet it did not take long for the "Greeks" to follow in the footsteps of the orientals. It is a general supposition that monasticism itself was grafted upon the Church institutions. Monks were late comers to the scene; therefore, they played a secondary role in the formation of the Christian Church. At first, particularly when one considers the evidence in the imperial and ecclesiastical legislation, this appears to be the case in reality. The first imperial laws pertaining to monks and monasteries were generally hostile. The laws ordered the monks not to leave their cells, not to dwell in the cities. They did not belong to the Church, nor were they part of the ecclesiastical institution; simply, they were eastern aliens with an idiosyncratic tint. However, in an increasingly Christian society when Christian values were being promoted by the emperors, it was perhaps not so easy to brush them aside: the law dating from 390 that ordered the monks to "inhabit desert places and desolate solitudes" was repealed two years later. Obviously, the lawmakers had realised the inefficiency of the first regulation. By the middle of the fifth century, that is, with the Council of Chalcedon in 451, monks were slowly becoming part of the Church. For the first time, at Chalcedon monks were placed irrevocably under the authority of the local bishop. The sixth century was prominent for the implementation of relatively detailed legislation concerning both the internal regulations and the status of the monks. These laws distinguished between the Great Church and its possessions, which included monasteries, and other monasteries. Hence, both the Constantinopolitan and provincial monasteries were lumped together, being in essence private foundations and contrasted with the Great Church which had a unique "imperial" status. Justinianic legislation remains largely in force in the period covered here. However, glimpses of the status of the monks can still be gleaned from the ecclesiastical legislation of the seventh and the eighth centuries, the Quinisext Council in 691 and the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787. Considering the legislation all together, one can argue that the monks occupied an intermediary position between the clergy and the laity. They were officially under the control of the local bishop, yet at the same time were partly outside his authority. This relates to the nature of their economic resources. Monks were not part of the Church since they were not in the pay-roll of the bishop and, likewise, were not sustained by the taxes paid by the villagers

or the citizens. Instead, they lived upon the lands provided them by the wealthy members of the society, if urban monasteries; the rural ones were self sufficient, living by the produce of their own hands. Both rural and urban monasteries paid the land tax, but were presumably free from the head tax. Hence, they were officially under the control of the local church, yet they were economically independent from the same institution. Similarly, they were not allowed to proclaim at councils. All the lists until the eighth century show that the monks were merely participants in councils or trials. This did not, however, affect their status in the eyes of the people. In ecclesiastical legislation monks were liable to *excommunication* like the laity; for a bishop the ultimate punishment was *expulsion* from his see. In time, however, they were accorded a higher status. The prominent sign of this change came at the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787, where the monks were for the first time in history allowed to proclaim at a church council. Until then, they were allowed to participate and sign the decisions and send letters to the emperors and patriarchs but the authority to proclaim had not yet been devolved, being in essence a prerogative of the leading bishops. Thus, at the beginning of the ninth century, they were fully inserted into the ecclesiastical institution. In the words of Theodore Stoudites:

"...τῆς ἐκκλησίας κοινωνικοί ἐσμεν, καὶ μὴ εἶη ἡμῖν ποτε διασχισθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῆς".⁴⁸⁷

This is best evidenced in the promotion of the *asekretis* Nikephoros to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Nikephoros initially donned the habit before he was rushed through the successive steps of deaconate and presbytership.⁴⁸⁸ Thus, being a monk constituted the lowest grade in the hierarchical ladder with the Patriarchate occupying its ultimate end. Hence, after the ninth century, it became much more of a common occurrence for patriarchs of Constantinople to start their profession at a monastery. Tarasios and Nikephoros were the precursors of Antonios from the Stoudios monastery, appointed Patriarch of Constantinople in 974, or Alexios (again from the Stoudios), Patriarch during 1025-1043. These are evidences at the same time of the importance of the monastery of Stoudios in Constantinopolitan politics after it replaced Dalmatios, consigning its hegoumenos to a secondary position. In terms of the "institutionalisation of monasticism", therefore, the ninth century constitutes a turning point. Until the ninth century, imperial monasteries in Constantinople were mainly founded by and for the female members of the imperial family; they represented neither the emperor in person, nor his personal authority. Emperors were still buried at the imperial mausoleums near the church of the Holy Apostles. In the ninth century, on the other hand, they were

⁴⁸⁷ *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, I, epist. 4, p. 18, lines. 43-44.

⁴⁸⁸ Nikephoros, *Short History*, introduction, pp. 1-2.

commemorated at monasteries like Basil I (867-886), emperor and saint who was commemorated at the monastery of Stoudios during the reign of his grandson Constantine VII.⁴⁸⁹ It is, therefore, after the ninth century that we get, for the first time, imperial monasteries of a different nature, representing not only the whole imperial family but above all the emperor and his God-given power which exerted imperial benevolence and charity to the citizens. Hence, from the tenth century onwards, every emperor (excluding those from the Macedonian dynasty) founded a monastery and came to be associated with it. Myrelaion embodied the piety and benevolence of Romanos Lekapenos (920-944); a similar ligature existed between Nikephoros II Phokas (963-969), John I Tzimiskes (963-969) and the Athonite monasteries, Romanos III Argyros (1028-1034) and Theotokos Peribleptos in Constantinople, Michael IV and Kosmas and Damian, Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055) and Nea Mone in Chios and St George of the Mangana in Constantinople.

In terms of institutionalisation of the liturgy, however, the flow of influence was rather from the monasteries to the official church. The monks created common *synaxes* of the formal liturgical hours of terce, sext and none, and compline as well as the bedtime prayer. In fact, where liturgy, prayer and the everyday practices are concerned, monasticism had a great influence which it brought to and grafted upon the Church rather than vice versa.⁴⁹⁰

In terms of the transformation of the internal regulations within Byzantine/Constantinopolitan monasteries, likewise one sees continuity with the eastern tradition rather than innovation. Monastic tradition was highly conservative, and although practices differed in various places, they remained essentially unchanged, even though some space was allowed for synthesis. It was the office of St Sabas of Palestine that the Stoudites synthesised. However, not all Studite *typika* were exact copies of an unchanging original, and neither was this a peculiarity of the Stoudites. Nikon of Black Mountain (ca. 1088) wrote: "I came upon and collected different *typika*, of Stoudios and of Jerusalem, and one did not agree with the other, neither Stoudite with another Stoudite, nor Jerusalem ones with Jerusalem ones".

Despite its variety, however, Stoudite practice did not constitute a cornerstone in terms of liturgical practices because, essentially, the Stoudite *typikon* drew largely upon the Sabaitic/Palestinian *typikon*. The *typika* themselves were subject to change; therefore, as time progressed, and as the synthesis between the Sabaitic and Constantinopolitan practices

⁴⁸⁹ E. Patlagean, "Les Stoudites, l'empereur et Rome: Figure byzantine d'un monachisme réformateur", in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*. (Spoleto: Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1988), vol. I, p. 452.

progressed, it grew in detail. Therefore, in terms of liturgical and inter-monastic practices, "Stoudite Reform" is less a reform than a synthesis.⁴⁹¹ What makes the Stoudite *typikon* special is its widespread use in Byzantium. Every Byzantine monastery used it as the prototype until Athos in the tenth century and Theotokos Evergetis in the eleventh century once again implemented further layers of new elements and partially replaced it. Yet this should not prevent us from seeing the initial Sabaitic influence on Stoudios. If libraries in Mt Athos had volumes of Theodore's works like the Great and Small *Catecheses* as well as his *vita* and letters, it seems that what is referred to as Stoudite Reform⁴⁹² entails the circulation of Theodore's *typikon* and his works:

"Although there are many and various traditions from prior times holding sway in the holy monasteries and although different monasteries are administered and governed by different rules for the heavenly kingdom, there is one of all these - the one in force among us - which is the best and most excellent, avoiding both excesses and deficiencies. This rule we have received from our great father and confessor Theodore. We are not alone in choosing it; the majority of excellent monks have chosen it as well. So, today we have been held by the fatherly commands to leave this rule in writing as an enduring monument for later generations; and as far as we can, we have submitted ourselves in obedience..."⁴⁹³

In the ninth century, the status of the monks and monasteries changed. Surely, in this change Theodore from the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople played an important role. Rather than "reforming" Byzantine monasticism, however, he continued the trend toward greater integration of monks into the Byzantine society, which was already in force since the fourth century.

⁴⁹⁰ Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, p. 225.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.* pp. 56-58.

⁴⁹² J. Leroy, "La réforme Stoudite", in *Il Monachesimo Orientale*, OCA 153 (1958), pp. 181-214. This was unavailable to me.

⁴⁹³ *BMFD* I, p. 97. Version B.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list does not include works already listed under Abbreviations.

A. Primary Sources and Reference Books

Athanasius, The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus, trans. R. C. Gregg, London, 1980.

Auzépy, M.-F. *La vie d'Etienne le Jeune par Etienne le Diacre*. Birmingham, 1997.

Cyril of Scythopolis. *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. R. M. Price. Kalamazoo, 1991.

Dagron, G. *Vie et miracles de Sainte Thècle. Texte grec, traduction et commentaire*. Brussels, 1978.

Delehaye, H. *Les saints stylites*. Brussels, repr. 1962.

Drijvers, H. J. W. and J. W., trans., *The Finding of the True Cross. The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*. CSCO Subsidia 93, Louvain, 1997.

Efthymiadis, S. ed. and trans., *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon* (BBOM 4). Aldershot, 1998.

Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land, trans. J. Wilkinson. Jerusalem and Warminster, 1981.

Eusebius. *The Life of Constantine*, trans. Av. Cameron and S. G. Hall, London and New York, 1999.

Festugière, A.-J. *Les moines d'Orient*. Vol I. Paris, 1961.

_____, ed. and trans. *Vie de Théodore de Sykeon*. 2 vols. Brussels, 1970.

Flavius Cresconius Corippus. In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris Libri II', ed. and trans. Av. Cameron. London, 1976.

Grumel, V. *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople de 715 à 1206*. 2nd ed. J. Darrouzès. Paris, 1989.

Halkin, F. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*. 2 vols. Brussels, 1957.

Halsall, P. "Life of St. Thomas of Lesbos", in *Holy Women of Byzantium. Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. A.-M. Talbot, Washington, D.C., 1996, 291-322.

The History of Evagrius Scholasticus, trans. M. Whitby, Liverpool, 2000.

Holy Women of the Syrian Orient, trans. S. Brock and S. Ashbrook-Harvey, Berkeley, 1987.

Janin, R. *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*. Paris, 1964.

- _____. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. Première partie: le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Les églises et les monastères.* Vol. III, Paris, 1969.
- John Moschos. *The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. J. Wortley, Kalamazoo, 1992.
- John of Ephesus, "Lives of the Eastern Saints", ed. and trans. E. Brooks, *PO* 17-19, (1923-1926), 1-307; 513-698; 153-285.
- John of Nikiu, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. R.H. Charles, London, 1916.
- Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford, 1987.
- Laurent, V. *Le corpus de sceaux de l'empire byzantin*. 4 vols. (L' église et l'administration centrale). Paris, 1963-1981. Tom. 5.2: L' église. Première partie (cont.), Paris, 1965.
- The Lives of the Desert Fathers. The Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, trans. N. Russell, Mowbray, 1992.
- Miller, T. "The Legend of Saint Zotikos According to Constantine Acropolites", *AB* 112 (1994), 339-376.
- Nestorius. *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson, Oxford, 1925.
- Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople. *Short History*, ed. and trans. C. Mango, Washington D.C., 1990.
- Pachomian Koinonia*, trans. A. Veilleux, vol I, Kalamazoo, 1980.
- Palladius. *Stories of the Holy Fathers being the Stories of the Anchorites, Recluses, Monks, Coenobites and Ascetic Fathers of the Deserts of Egypt between ca. 250-400 A.D.*, trans. E. W. Budge, London, 1934.
- Procopius. *The Buildings*, trans. H.B. Dewing, vol. 7, London, 1971.
- Rosenqvist, J. O., ed. and trans., *The Life St. Irene Abbess of Chrysobalanton. A Critical Edition with Introduction*. Uppsala, 1986.
- The Seven Ecumenical Councils. [A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers]*, ed. and trans. under the supervision of P. Schaff and H. Wace, vol. 14, Edinburgh, 1997.
- Severus. *The Letters. The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus*, trans. E.W. Brooks, 2 vols. London, 1904.
- Socrates. in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, trans. P. Schaff, vol. II, Edinburgh, repr. 1997.
- Sozomen. in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, trans. P. Schaff, vol. II, Edinburgh, repr. 1997.

Speck, P. *Jamben auf verschiedene Gegenstände*. Berlin, 1968.

Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, ed. H. Delehay, *Propylaeum ad AASS Nov.* Brussels, 1902

Theodoret, *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues and Letters*, trans. B. Jackson, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. III, Edinburgh, 1996.

Theodori Studitae Epistulae. ed. G. Fatouros, 2 vols., Berlin, 1991.

Three Byzantine Saints, trans. E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes, Oxford, 1948.

Zachariah of Mitylene, *The Syriac Chronicle of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, London, 1899.

B. Secondary Sources

Abrahamse, D. Z. de F. *Hagiographic Sources for Byzantine Cities 500-900 AD*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1967.

Alexander, P.J. *Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford, 1958.

Angelidi, C. "Un texte patriographique et édifiant: le 'Discours narratif' sur les Hodègoi", *RÉB* 52 (1994), 113-149.

_____, "The Veneration of the Virgin Hodegetria and the Hodegon Monastery", in *Mother of God*. ed. M. Vassilaki, Athens, 2001, 373-387.

Arnheim, M. T.W. *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1972.

Ashbrook-Harvey, S. "The Holy and the Poor: Models from early Syriac Christianity", in *Through the Eye of a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. E. Albu Hanawalt, C. Lindberg, Kirksville, 1994, 43-66.

Auzépy, M.-F. "La place des moines à Nicée II (787)", *Byzantion* 58 (1988), 5-21.

Bacht, H. "Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431-519)", in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, eds. H. Bacht and A. Grillmeier, vol II, Würzburg, 1953, 193-314.

Bardill, J. "The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople and the Monophysite Refugees", *DOP* 54 (2001), 1-11.

Berger, A. *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*. Bonn, 1988.

_____. "Regionen und Strassen im frühen Konstantinopel", *IstMitt*, 47 (1997), 349-414.

- _____. "Streets and Public Spaces in Constantinople", *DOP* 54 (2000), 161-172.
- Binns, J. *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631*. Oxford, 1994.
- Brogiolo, G. P., N. Gautier, N. Christie, eds. *Towns and their Territories between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Leiden, 2000.
- Brown, P. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity", *JRS* 61 (1971), 80-101.
- _____. *The Cult of the Saints*. Chicago, 1981.
- _____. *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, 1982.
- _____. *The Body and Society. Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York, 1988.
- _____. *Authority and the Sacred*. Cambridge, 1995.
- _____. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. Massachusetts, 1996.
- Brown, T. S. *Gentlemen and Officers. Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554-800*. Rome, 1984.
- Brubaker, L. and J. Haldon, eds. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca. 680-850): The Sources*. Aldershot, 2001.
- Bryer, A. "The Late Byzantine Monastery in Town and Countryside", in *The Church in Town and Countryside*, ed. D. Baker, *SCH* 16, (1979), 219-241.
- Bryer, A. and J. Herrin, eds. *Iconoclasm. Papers Presented at the Ninth Symposium of Byzantine Studies*. Birmingham, 1977.
- Cameron, Av. "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II", in *The Orthodox Churches and the Christian West*, ed. D. Baker, *SCH* 13 (1976), 51-67.
- Charanis, P. "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society", *DOP* 25 (1971), 61-83.
- Cheynet, J.-C. and B. Flusin, "Du monastère Ta Kathara à Thessalonique: Theodore Studite sur la route de l'exil", *REB* 48 (1990), 193-211.
- Chitty, D. *The Desert a City*. Oxford, 1966.
- Clark, E.A. "Authority and Humility: A Conflict of Values in Fourth Century Female Monasticism", *ByzF* 9 (1985), 17-33.
- Constantelos, D.J. *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*. New Brunswick, 1968.
- da Costa-Louillet, G. "Saints de Constantinople aux VIII, IX et Xe siècles", *Byzantion* 24 (1954) 179-263.
- Dagron, G. "Les moines et la ville: Le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine (451)", *TM* 4 (1970), 229-276.

- _____. *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*. Paris, 1974.
- _____. "Le christianisme dans la ville byzantine", *DOP* 31 (1977), 3-25.
- _____. *Constantinople imaginaire. Études sur le recueil des Patria*. Paris, 1984.
- _____. "L'église et la chrétienté byzantines entre invasions et l'Iconoclasme (VIIe-début VIIIe siècle)", in *Histoire du Christianisme*, eds. J.-M. Mayeur, Ch. and L. Pietri, A. Vauches and M. Venard, 4th vol. (610-1054) Desclée, 1993, 9-90.
- _____. *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin*. Paris, 1996.
- Dalrymple, W. *From the Holy Mountain. A Journey in the Shadow of Byzantium*. London, 1997.
- Ferrari, G. *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents of Rome from the Fifth through the Tenth Century*. Rome, 1957.
- Frantz, A. "From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens", *DOP* 19 (1965), 187-205.
- Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. Cambridge, 1972.
- Galatariotou, C. "Byzantine ktetorika typika. A Comparative Study", *RÉB* 45, 1987, 77-138.
- Gero, S. *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*. Louvain, 1973.
- _____. *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*. Louvain, 1977.
- Granič, B. "Die rechtliche Stellung und Organisation der griechischen Kloster nach dem justinianischen Recht", *BZ* 29 (1929-30), 6-34.
- Gregory, T. *Vox Populi. Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* Columbus, 1979.
- Grierson, P. "The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors (337-1042)", *DOP* 16 (1962), 1-63.
- Haldon, J. *Byzantium in the 7th Century. Transformation of a Culture*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1997.
- Hall, G. *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church*. London, 1991.
- Hanson, P. "The Ancient Near Eastern Roots of Social Welfare", in *Through the Eye of a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. E. Albu Hanawalt, C. Lindberg, Kirksville, 1994, 7-28.

- Harrison, R.M. *Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul*. 2 vols. Princeton and Washington D.C., 1986.
- _____, *A Temple for Byzantium. The Discovery and Excavation of Anicia Juliana's Palace-Church in Istanbul*. London, 1989.
- Hatlie, P. "Redeeming Byzantine Epistolography", *BMGS* 20 (1996), 213-248.
- Heather, P. *Goths and Romans 332-489*. Oxford, 1991.
- _____, "New Men for New Constantines? Creating an Imperial Elite in the Eastern Mediterranean", in *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium. 4th-13th Centuries*, ed. P. Magdalino, Aldershot, 1994, 11-33.
- Herrin, J. *The Formation of Christendom*. London, 1987.
- Hirschfeld, V. "List of the Byzantine Monasteries in the Judean Desert", in *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land*, eds. G. C. Bottini, L. Di Segni, E. Alliata, Jerusalem, 1990, 1-90.
- _____, *The Judean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period*. New Haven, Conn. and London, 1992.
- Holum, K. *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Los Angeles, 1982.
- Honoré, T. *Law in the Crisis of the Empire (379-455). The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors with a Palingenesia of Laws of the Dynasty*. Oxford, 1998.
- Hunt, E. D. *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460*. Oxford, 1982.
- Hussey, J.M. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Cambridge, 1954.
- _____, "Byzantine Monasticism", in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume IV, Part II. Cambridge, 1967, 161-184.
- Jolivet-Lévy, C., M. Kaplan, J.-P. Sodini, eds. *Les saints et leur sanctuaires à Byzance*. Paris, 1993.
- Jones, A.H.M. "Church Finance in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries", *JTS* 2 (1960), 84-94.
- _____, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602*. Vol. II. London, repr. 1990.
- Kaplan, M. *Les propriétés de la couronne et de l'église dans l'empire byzantin (Ve-VIe siècles)*. Paris, 1976.
- _____, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VIIe au XIe siècle. Propriété et exploitation du sol*. Paris, 1992.
- _____, "Les sanctuaires de Theodore de Sykéon", in *Les saints et leur sanctuaires à Byzance*, eds. C. Jolivet-Lévy, M. Kaplan, J.-P. Sodini, Paris, 1993, 65-79.

- _____, "Le saint, le village et la cité", in *Les saints et leur sanctuaires à Byzance*, eds. C. Jolivet-Lévy, M. Kaplan, J.-P. Sodini, Paris, 1993, 81-94.
- _____, "Les moines et leur biens fonciers à Byzance du VIII^e au Xe siècle", *RBén* 103 (1993), 209-223.
- _____, "L'hinterland religieux de Constantinople: moines et saints de banlieu d'après l'hagiographie", in *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, eds. G. Dagron and C. Mango, Aldershot, 1995, 191-205.
- Karlin-Hayter, P. "A Byzantine Politician Monk: Saint Theodore Studite", *JÖB* 44 (1994), 217-232.
- Karras, V. "Life of St. Elisabeth the Wonderworker", in *Holy Women of Byzantium. Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. A.-M. Talbot, Washington, D.C., 1996, 117-135.
- Kazhdan, A. "Byzantium and Social Welfare", in *Through the Eye of a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. E. Albu Hanawalt, C. Lindberg, Kirksville, 1994, 67-82.
- Kazhdan, A. and G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies*. Washington, 1982.
- Kountoura-Galake, E. *Ο Βυζαντινός Κλήρος και η Κοινωνία των Σκοτεινών Αιώνων*. Athens, 1996.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. *Antioch. City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1972.
- _____, "Friends and Enemies of John Chrysostom", in *Maistor. Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, ed. A. Moffat, Canberra, 1984, 85-111.
- Limberis, V. *Divine Heiress*. London and New York, 1994.
- Lowther-Clarke, W.K. *St. Basil the Great. A Study in Byzantine Monasticism*. Cambridge, 1913.
- Maas, M. "People and Identity in Roman Antioch", in *Antioch. The Lost Ancient City*, ed. C. Kondoleon, Princeton, 2000, 13-21.
- Mackay-Ringrose, K. *Saints Holy Men and Byzantine Society 726-843*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Rutgers University, 1976.
- Magdalino, P. "Church, Bath and *Diakonia* in Medieval Constantinople", in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. R. Morris, Birmingham, 1990, 165-188.

- _____, *Constantinople médiévale. Études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*. Paris, 1996.
- _____, "Aristocratic *Oikoi* in the Tenth and Eleventh Regions of Constantinople" in *Byzantine Constantinople. Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life*, ed. N. Necipoğlu. Leiden, 2001, 53-69.
- Malamut, E. *Sur la route des saints byzantines*. Paris, 1993.
- Mango, C. "Les monuments de l'architecture du XI^e siècle et leur signification historique et sociale", *TM* 6 (1976), 351-365.
- _____, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. London, 1980.
- _____, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e-VII^e siècles)*. Paris, 2nd ed. 1990.
- _____, "The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre", in *idem, Studies on Constantinople*. Aldershot, 1993, I, 117-136.
- _____, "The Fourteenth Region of Constantinople", in *idem, Studies on Constantinople*. Aldershot, 1993, VIII, 1-5.
- _____, "The Origins of the Blachernae Shrine at Constantinople", *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae. Studi di Antichità Cristiana Pubblicati a Cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana. Vjesnik za Archeologiju i Historiju Dalmatinsku*. Supl. Vol. 87-89 (1998), 61-76.
- _____, "The Triumphal Way of Constantinople and the Golden Gate", *DOP* 54 (2001) 173-188.
- Mango, C. and I. Ševčenko. "Some Churches and Monasteries on the Southern Shore of the Sea of Marmara", *DOP* 27 (1973), 235-277.
- Marazzi, F. "Rome in Transition: Economic and Political Change in the Fourth and the Fifth Centuries", in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, ed. J. Smith, Leiden, 2000, 21-41.
- Mathews, T. *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*. University Park and London, 1971.
- Mayeur, J.-M., Ch. Pietri, L. Pietri, A. Vauchez and M. Venard, eds., *Histoire du Christianisme (610-1054)*, vol. 4. Desclée, 1993.
- McGuckin, J. *St. Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy, its History, Theological Texts*. Leiden, 1994.
- Metcalf, W. E. "The Mint of Antioch", in *Antioch. The Lost Ancient City*, ed. C. Kondoleon, Princeton, 2000, 105-111.

- Miller, T. S. "The Sampson Hospital of Constantinople", *ByzF* 15 (1990), 121-135.
- _____, "The Orphanotropheion of Constantinople", in *Through the Eye of a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. E. Albu Hanawalt, C. Lindberg, Kirksville, 1994, 83-104.
- _____, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*. Baltimore and London, 1997.
- Morris, R. *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium 843-1118*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Mullett, M. and A. Kirby, eds. *Work and Worship at the Theotokos Evergetis 1050-1200*. Belfast, 1997.
- Müller-Wiener, W. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls*. Tübingen, 1977.
- Ousterhout, R. "Loca Sancta and the Architectural response to Pilgrimage", in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout, Urbana and Chicago, 1990, 108-124.
- Papachryssanthou, D. "La vie monastique dans les campagnes byzantines, du VIII^e au XI^e siècle", *Byzantion* 43 (1971), 158-180.
- Patlagean, E. *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles*. Mouton, Paris, La Haye, 1977.
- _____. "Sainteté et pouvoir", *The Byzantine Saint. University of Birmingham 14th Spring Symposium*, in ed. S. Hackel, London, 1981, 88-105.
- _____. "Les Stoudites. l'empereur et Rome: Figure byzantine d'un monochisme réformateur", in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*, vol. I, Spoleto, 1988, 429-460.
- Peters, F.E. *Jerusalem. The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times*. Princeton, 1985.
- Pratsch, Th. *Theodoros Studites (759-826)- zwischen Dogma und Pragma*. Berlin, 1997.
- Rochow, I. *Kaiser Konstantine I., 741-775. Materialien zu seinem Leben und Nachleben*. Berlin, 1994.
- Ruggieri, V. *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582-867): Its History and Structural Elements*. Rome, 1991.
- Saradi, H. "Constantinople and its Saints: 4th-6th Centuries. The Image of the City and Social Considerations". *Studi Medievali* 36 (1995), 87-110.
- Seiber, J. *Early Byzantine Urban Saints*. BAR Supplementary Series, 37, London, 1997.
- Sidéris, G. *Eunuques et pouvoir à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sorbonne University, Paris, 2001.

- Sivan, H. S. "Pilgrimage, Monasticism and the Emergence of Christian Pa
Century", in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout, U
1990, 54-65.
- Stauridou-Zaphraka, A. "Ἡ μονὴ Μωσηλὲ καὶ ἡ Μονὴ τῶν Ἀνθεμίου", *Byz*
92.
- Stevenson, J. *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating
Church, AD 337-461*. (Revised ed. by W.H.C. Frend), London
Taft, R. *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West. The Origins of the D
Meaning for Today*. Collegeville, Minn., 1986.
- _____, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History*. Collegeville, Minn., 1992.
- Talbot, A.-M. "Byzantine Women, Saints' Lives, and Social Welfare", in
a Needle. Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare, eds. E.
Lindberg, Kirksville, 1994, 105-122.
- Thomas, J. P. *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*
1987.
- Treadgold, W. *The Byzantine Revival 780-842*. Stanford, 1988.
- Trombley, F. R. *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*. 2 vols
Vasiliev, A. A. *Justin I. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the*
Mass., 1950.
- Vööbus, A. *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient. A Contribution
Culture in the Near East*. 3 vols. Louvain, 1958-1988.
- Ward, A.B. *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*. Kalamazoo, 1975.